

conference reports, and there has to be, in the last month of every session, a good deal of vigilance in seeing that the appropriation bills are presented as fast as possible to the Senate. Then they are out of the way. In fact, the rules are based upon the idea that they shall have preference.

I never have known a time when complaint was made that the appropriation bills take undue time. So far as I am concerned, I do not encroach, nor do any of my associates on the committee, nor do the chairmen of the other committees having them in charge encroach upon the time of the Senate.

I made the suggestion because the desire was expressed by several Senators. The first suggestion, as I said, was to adjourn until Saturday, but it seemed to me that we had better devote Friday to business, and I especially was interested, because we have an important appropriation bill to be reported on that day. I leave it entirely, of course, to the Senate to decide the matter.

Mr. BACON. I have no doubt that the suggestion of the Senator from Maine will be favorably acted upon by the Senate. I wish to say that no one has ever accused the Appropriations Committee or the committees which have appropriation bills of unduly occupying the time of the Senate in their consideration. My observation has been the other way.

Mr. HALE. I was going to say, it has been rather the other way.

Mr. BACON. I think we ought to give a little more consideration to them. As I suggested the other day, when the Senator was protesting against some very large expenditures which were recommended, it would be well if the Appropriations Committee would take the balance of us in their confidence a little and tell us a little more about these appropriation bills when passed, and take a little more time in their consideration.

But I rose simply to say, in response to the Senator in connection with my former suggestion as to a desire upon our part for some legislation, that while it is true, as stated by the Senator, that it has been universally the case that not much time has been occupied by the Senate in the disposal of appropriation bills, it is equally true, universally true, that when the appropriation bills have been passed Congress adjourns regardless of other legislation. Therefore we desire to have some legislation before all the appropriation bills are passed.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the question be put on my motion, that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

COMPANIES B, C, AND D, TWENTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday, after the conclusion of the morning business, I desire to make some remarks upon the bill (S. 6206) for the relief of certain former members of the Twenty-fifth Regiment of United States Infantry.

INDIAN ALLOTMENTS IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 6525) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to remove restrictions on Indian allotments in Oklahoma for school-site purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "prices," to insert "to be fixed;" and on page 2, line 4, after the words "full bloods," to insert "and minors," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell for school purposes to school districts of the State of Oklahoma, from the unallotted lands of the Five Civilized Tribes, tracts of lands not to exceed 2 acres in any one district at prices to be fixed and under regulations to be prescribed by him, and proper conveyance of such lands shall be executed in accordance with existing laws and regulating the conveyance of tribal property; and the Secretary of the Interior also shall have the authority to remove the restrictions on the sale of such lands, not to exceed 2 acres in each case, as allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and allottees under the jurisdiction of the Osage and Quapaw Indian agencies, including full bloods and minors who may desire to sell for school purposes.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, April 17, 1908, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 15, 1908.

[Continuation of the legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1908.]

The recess having expired, at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the pending motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—60 ayes and 30 noes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask for tellers.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point that the motion is dilatory.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when one asks for tellers, after a division which shows the absence of a quorum, that that certainly can not be considered dilatory.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present, but there are twice as many voting "aye" as voting "no." There are other ways of ascertaining, but the Chair is inclined to sustain the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was afraid that the Chair would be so inclined, and I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, evidently no quorum is present, and in order to have the yeas and nays under a call of the House under the rule, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the gentleman's suggestion of no quorum is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. On the contrary, the Chair is of opinion that it is the most speedy way to get a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was afraid that the Chair would so hold.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and all those in favor of the motion will, when their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed "nay;" and those present and not voting will answer "present." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 263, nays 6, answered "present" 16, not voting 102, as follows:

YEAS—263.

Adair	Dawson	Holliday	Moore, Tex.
Adamson	De Armond	Houston	Morse
Aiken	Denby	Howell, N. J.	Mudd
Alexander, Mo.	Denver	Howell, Utah	Murdock
Alexander, N. Y.	Diekema	Howland	Murphy
Allen	Dixon	Hubbard, Iowa	Needham
Ames	Douglas	Hubbard, W. Va.	Nelson
Andrus	Draper	Hughes, N. J.	Nicholls
Anthony	Driscoll	Hull, Iowa	Norris
Ashbrook	Dwight	Hull, Tenn.	Nye
Bartoldt	Ellerbe	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Connell
Bartlett, Ga.	Ellis, Mo.	Humphreys, Miss.	Olcott
Bates	Ellis, Oreg.	Johnson, S. C.	Padgett
Beall, Tex.	Englebright	Jones, Wash.	Page
Bell, Ga.	Esch	Kelley	Parker, N. J.
Bennett, Ky.	Fairchild	Kelher	Parker, S. Dak.
Birdsall	Ferris	Kennedy, Iowa	Parsons
Bonyng	Finley	Kennedy, Ohio	Payne
Booher	Flood	Kinkaid	Perkins
Bowers	Floyd	Kitchin, Claude	Peters
Boyd	Foss	Knapp	Porter
Brantley	Foster, Ill.	Knowland	Pray
Brodhead	Foster, Ind.	Küstermann	Raney
Burke	Foulkrod	Lafean	Rauch
Burleigh	French	Lamar, Mo.	Reeder
Burleson	Fuller	Landis	Reid
Burnett	Fulton	Lanning	Reynolds
Burton, Del.	Galnes, W. Va.	Lassiter	Richardson
Eurton, Ohio	Gardner, Mich.	Law	Robinson
Butler	Gardner, N. J.	Lawrence	Rodenberg
Byrd	Garner	Leake	Rothermel
Calder	Garrett	Legare	Rucker
Calderhead	Gilhams	Lilley	Russell, Mo.
Caldwell	Gill	Lindbergh	Russell, Tex.
Campbell	Gillett	Littlefield	Sabath
Candler	Godwin	Livingston	Saunders
Capron	Goebel	Lloyd	Scott
Carlin	Goldfogle	Longworth	Sheppard
Carter	Gordon	Loud	Sherley
Cary	Graft	Loudenslager	Sherwood
Caulfield	Greene	Loving	Sims
Chaney	Gregg	Lowden	Slayden
Chapman	Hackett	McCall	Slemp
Clark, Mo.	Hackney	McDermott	Smith, Cal.
Clayton	Hale	McGavin	Smith, Iowa
Cockran	Hamilton, Iowa	McGuire	Smith, Mo.
Conner	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Tex.
Cook, Pa.	Hammond	McKinley, Ill.	Southwick
Cooper, Pa.	Hardwick	McLachlan, Cal.	Sparkman
Cooper, Tex.	Haskins	McLain	Sperry
Cooper, Wis.	Haugen	McLaughlin, Mich.	Spight
Cox, Ind.	Hawley	McMillan	Stafford
Craig	Hayes	Macon	Steenerson
Cravens	Heffin	Madden	Stephens, Tex.
Crumpacker	Helm	Madison	Sterling
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Malby	Stevens, Minn.
Cushman	Henry, Tex.	Mann	Sturgiss
Daizell	Hill, Conn.	Marshall	Sulloway
Darragh	Hinsshaw	Maynard	Talbot
Davidson	Hitchcock	Mondell	Tawney
Davis, Minn.	Hobson	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ala.

Taylor, Ohio
Thistlewood
Thomas, N. C.
Thomas, Ohio.
Tirrell

Tou Velle
Townsend
Voistead
Vreeland
Wanger

Washburn
Watson
Willett
Williams
Wilson, Ill.

Wilson, Pa.
Wood
Woodyard
Young

NAYS—6.

Ansberry
Burgess

Hay
Johnson, Ky.

Jones, Va.

Underwood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—16.

Bennet, N. Y.
Brownlow
Cousins

Fassett
Foster, Vt.
Goulden
Griggs

Harrison
Jenkins
Lamb
Lee

Moon, Tenn.
Olmsted
Roberts
Sherman

NOT VOTING—102.

Acheson
Bannon
Barchfeld
Barclay
Bartlett, Nev.
Beale, Pa.
Bede
Bingham
Bradley
Brockard
Brumm
Brundidge
Clark, Fla.
Cocks, N. Y.
Cole
Cook, Colo.
Coudrey
Crawford
Davenport
Davey, La.
Dawes
Dunwell
Durey
Edwards, Ga.
Edwards, Ky.
Favrot

Fitzgerald
Focht
Fordney
Fornes
Fowler
Gaines, Tenn.
Gardner, Mass.
Gillespie
Glass
Graham
Granger
Gronna
Haggott
Hall
Hamill
Hamlin
Harling
Hepburn
Higgins
Hill, Miss.
Howard
Huff
Hughes, W. Va.
Jackson
James, Addison D.

James, Ollie M.
Kahn
Kimball
Kipp
Kitchin, Wm. W.
Knopf
Lamar, Fla.
Langley
Lenahan
Lever
Lewis
Lindsay
Lorimer
McCreary
McHenry
McKinney
McMorran
Miller
Moon, Pa.
Mouser
Overstreet
Patterson
Pearre
Pollard
Pou
James, Addison D.

Pratt
Prince
Pujo
Randell, Tex.
Ransdell, La.
Rhinoek
Riordan
Ryan
Shackelford
Small
Smith, Mich.
Snapp
Stanley
Sulzer
Waldo
Wallace
Watkins
Webb
Weeks
Weems
Weisse
Wheeler
Wiley
Wolf

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the vote:

Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. HARRISON.

For the day:

Mr. FASSETT with Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada.

Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. LAMB.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. PUJO.

Mr. BEDE with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. POWERS with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. WALDO with Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WEEKS with Mr. WOLF.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. WILEY.

For one week:

Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. MOON of Tennessee.

Until further notice:

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. MCKINNEY with Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. POLLARD with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. ADDISON D. JAMES with Mr. KIMBALL.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. DAVENPORT.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. HAMLIN.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.

Mr. MCGUIRE with Mr. STANLEY.

Mr. JACKSON with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. CRAWFORD.

Mr. BANNON with Mr. FAVROT.

Mr. BARCLAY with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. BEALE of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. BRUMM with Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. COCKS of New York with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. COLE with Mr. HARDY.

Mr. COOK of Colorado with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. KIPP.

Mr. GRONNA with Mr. LAMAR of Florida.

Mr. HALL with Mr. LEE.

Mr. HARDING with Mr. LENAHAN.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. MCHENRY.

Mr. MCCREARY with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. MCMORRAN with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. MILLER with Mr. RYAN.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

For the session:

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. BENNET of New York with Mr. FARNES.

Mr. KNOFF with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened. Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20471, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. MANN in the chair.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. At what stage of the bill are we, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 75, line 17.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask now to return at this time to the paragraph that was passed by consent yesterday that I may offer an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Pending that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment here which I would like to have voted on now, if it is agreeable to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Clerk commences to read, the committee will return to the portion of the bill that was passed for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not do that now. The paragraph involves the expenditure of a large amount of money on a great many ships, and I know that Members would like to have some information in regard to the necessity for these repairs and the character of them, in order that we may have a record of them and of what is asked.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will pass that matter for the present.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 75, after line 16, insert:

"That so much of the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, as reads, 'And provided further: That hereafter no payment shall be made from appropriations made by Congress to any officer in the Navy or Marine Corps on the active or retired list while such officer is employed after June 30, 1897, by any person or company furnishing naval supplies or war material to the Government; and such employment is hereby made unlawful after said date,' be amended by striking out the words 'or retired.'"

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Pending the point of order, I would like to state briefly what this amendment means. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment would have come more appropriately at another stage of the bill, but I did not happen to be on the floor when that part of the bill was passed. Now, this will correct some legislation that became a part of the naval appropriation bill in 1897, which very grievously discriminates against retired officers in the Navy. It prohibits any retired officer in the Navy, young or old, and for whatever purpose he may have been retired, whether on account of physical disability or age, from getting employment or taking employment in connection with the persons who deal with the Government of the United States. There is no such restriction applying to the retired officers in the Army, and it operates as a very grievous burden to many of the men who are now on the retired list. Many young men have left the Navy—retired necessarily under the rules on account of physical incapacity or disability—who are perfectly able to render valuable service to men in private life, and this prevents them from rendering such service where their employers are furnishing material to the Government.

There are many men on the retired list, retired for age, who are perfectly capable of rendering valuable service and taking valuable compensation therefor who are prohibited by this provision, which went through on an appropriation bill in 1897, from receiving such compensation as retired officers if they render such service, and no legitimate reason, in my judgment, can be suggested why the rendering of such services is in any way disadvantageous to the Government. Now, I will send to the desk and ask to have read, as a further explanation of this proposition, an editorial from the Washington Post, after which I hope the gentleman who raised the point of order, taking into account the obvious merits involved in this proposition, will feel

as though he might withdraw it and let this become a part of this bill. I do not ordinarily believe in legislation on appropriation bills, but this particular legislation that this undertakes to correct went through in the first instance on an appropriation bill, and if there is any excuse for such legislation, there is certainly reason why this also, for the purpose of correcting that, should become a part of this appropriation bill. Now I will ask that the Clerk will read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Editorial Washington Post, February 10, 1908.]

AN UNJUST LAW.

A contemporary records the interesting fact that, a few days since, a naval surgeon on the retired list, now engaged in private practice, was called upon to perform a serious operation for appendicitis at the home of a wealthy butcher. The operation successfully performed and the patient fully recovered, the latter asked the surgeon for his bill, and received this surprising reply: "My charge would ordinarily be \$200, but, inasmuch as you occasionally supply the navy-yard with beef, I am forbidden by law to accept a cent."

This recalls an equally ludicrous case in which a junior lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy, at present practicing law, defended before a police court a captain of a sand scow charged with having assaulted one of his crew. After securing the acquittal of his client, and as he was about to receive a much coveted fee of \$15, it developed that the captain had a contract for supplying the local navy-yard with \$100 worth of sand. "Nothing doing," replied the lawyer, as he dejectedly pushed back the bills offered by his client. "I'm a junior lieutenant, placed on the retired list of the Navy because of heart disease contracted in the line of duty, and the law forbids my taking any compensation from you."

These incidents, incredible as they seem, are based upon an amendment to the naval appropriation act of 1897, as follows:

"Hereafter no payment shall be made from appropriations made by Congress to any officer in the Navy or Marine Corps, on the active or retired list, while such an officer is employed, after June 30, 1897, by any person or company furnishing naval supplies or war material to the Government; and such employment is hereby made unlawful after said date."

The intent of this act is very plain. It is to prevent the improper employment by contractors of officers in the Navy and Marine Corps. It should apply to Army officers also. But, as it stands, it works an injustice to the officers affected, and it should be amended so that officers in any branch of the service may honestly perform services for civilians and accept pay for them. The precautions against possible grafting ought to be made in such fashion as to avoid working a hardship to men who have no desire to graft, and who ask only a fair opportunity to utilize honorably the ability and experience they may possess.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I think it is bad policy to legislate on an appropriation bill. This amendment is not germane to the part of the bill to which it is offered as an amendment. The policy of allowing retired officers to enter the service of people who are engaged in furnishing the Government supplies is a bad policy and ought not to be tolerated, and hence I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. No; I concede I am entirely at the mercy of my friend from Illinois. There is no question of its being legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 66. Joint resolution providing for additional lands for Wyoming under the provisions of the Carey Act;

S. 5657. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Westerly, R. I.;

S. 4692. An act providing for the purchase of a site for a public building at Poplar Bluff, Mo.;

S. 1762. An act for the relief of the trustees of the Davenport Female College; and

S. 1385. An act to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian reservations, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 17305. An act to regulate the establishment and maintenance of private hospitals and asylums in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound at the Government Printing Office

10,000 copies of the preliminary report of the Inland Waterways Commission, with illustrations, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the House of Representatives, 2,500 copies for the Senate, and 2,500 copies for the use of the Commission.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15653. An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers of the late civil war, the war with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late civil war.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total under quartermaster, Marine Corps, \$2,316,999.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. An all-important question is before this House to-day. Shall we abandon our traditional policy maintained since the very foundation of the Republic and become involved in the antagonisms and conflicts of other nations? Shall we take a step which the world will interpret as one of militant ambition for empire? We can not explain this ambitious programme by the claim that we desire to become the peacemaker of the world. If we make such a claim, the judicious will say it will prove ineffective, the skeptical will term it a dream, and the unfriendly will call it a specious pretense.

In the discussion of this proposition for the enlargement of our fleet of battle ships I wish to emphasize an undeniable fact. Our country has enjoyed an unprecedented growth and has attained a position in the very fore front among nations, not by the strength of armies or navies, but by our unique position and by the confidence in our impartiality and justice. This does not mean that we have not achieved most notable triumphs on the land and on the sea. American valor is entitled to the highest praise, and we may congratulate ourselves that whenever the Republic is in peril tens of thousands will rise up ready to defend our country with the last drop of their blood. We have relied more upon the efficiency and quality of our armies and navies than upon numbers or even preparedness.

Especial attention should be given to that which is the most prominent feature of our diplomatic relations—the Monroe doctrine. It is easy to prove that this has been maintained and has gained the acquiescence of all nations not by reason of military armament at all. At first we had the friendly suggestion and then the support of England in the enunciation of this principle. What is the basis of the Monroe doctrine? It is this: That the Western Hemisphere is not merely geographically separate from the Eastern Hemisphere, but politically distinct as well. We have here separate interests, different political conceptions and ideas. So from the days of President Monroe, and even before—for we may find traces of the doctrine in the days of Washington—we have asserted our title to the predominant power in this hemisphere. That claim has come to be, if not a rule of international law, nevertheless, by the comity of nations and by universal consent, a settled doctrine or principle.

In every instance it has been sustained without any exercise of physical force. Not a single gun has been fired, not a sword has been raised in support of the Monroe doctrine at any time. The most strenuous assertion of it was in the years 1895 and 1896. The United States insisted that, in a boundary dispute between Venezuela and Great Britain, the decision should be left to arbitration. Whatever may have been the relations of the nations of Europe with Great Britain, the political opinion of all those countries was against us.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. Would the gentleman, in the present state of arbitration in the world, leave the vital interests of the nation to depend upon arbitration when there is no arbitration for vital interests?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I would leave them to arbitration if I could, and, if not, to our prestige as a nation and the world's desire for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. HOBSON. To our strength?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Our strength not only in our Navy and Army, but in our resources and our position in the world. There is no country, strong or weak in military armament, which desires the ill will of the American nation. [Applause.] This contention of ours was promptly acquiesced in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for, say, five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Now, what was the relative strength of the two countries at that time? We had three first-class battle ships and two second class—five in all. Great Britain had over thirty, and, as I said, the political opinion of Europe, whether friendly to Great Britain or not, was against us. Is not this an absolute demonstration that it was not by the strength of our Navy or by any dependence upon it, but because of our standing among the nations and the acquiescence in that doctrine, that arbitration was obtained? I could refer to a score of instances, but I will mention only one or two more. France, Great Britain, and Spain made a quasi alliance in 1861 for the collection of debts in Mexico. At the very beginning they signed an agreement that they should not seek to acquire any territory. When France seemed to show designs for colonial acquisition, or for the setting up of a dynasty under the control of Emperor Napoleon, Great Britain and Spain promptly withdrew. We were at that time engaged in the bloodiest civil war in the history of nations. But what was the result? France failed to obtain a permanent foothold in that country, and the Monroe doctrine remained unshaken.

And so it will be in the future. Nations are not now allowed to acquire additional territory without the consent of the rest, except in the case of barbarous tribes occupying territory such as that of Africa or some of the outlying portions of the earth; and their so-called "spheres of influence" are defined. There is a concert of action among them, a balance of power to be preserved, so that no acquisition shall be made by one without general approval. And if this doctrine has been maintained when we had a weak Navy, when we had no Navy, and at times when political rivalries and contests were rife in the world, how much more will it be maintained in these early days of the twentieth century, when every tendency is toward a community of interest among nations, when disturbance of the world's peace awakens universal disapprobation, and when the strong are not allowed to impose upon the weak? [Applause.] We can not be compared with China. We are not in the same class. [Applause.]

Mention has been made of those who have migrated to this country from foreign lands and of the oppression practiced upon those of their kindred or race by foreign governments. There is not one of us who has not the most heartfelt sympathy for the downtrodden Jews of Russia, and for all others who suffer wrong in other lands; but do we mean that we are to take up the sword on behalf of all those who dwell in any nation represented by immigrants in this country? If so, we have all Europe to contend with, and not four battle ships, but fifty, is what our programme should be. And again, we have accomplished much more for the oppressed and unfortunate citizens of the Old World in other ways. It has been by remonstrance, by the influences of diplomacy, by holding up a higher ideal of the relation between rulers and peoples, an ideal which looks toward the equality of all men before the law. [Applause.]

When you abandon these helpful policies and say that not by moral forces, but by means of a navy, with which we shall become involved in conflicts with them all—then shall we lose our opportunity and fail to accomplish such triumphs of amelioration as were achieved under Secretary Hay, under Secretary Root, and under a long line of their illustrious predecessors. If there were time I should be glad to exhibit the utterly illogical nature of the argument in favor of four new battle ships. What is sought? Are we to have a preponderating navy? Why, if we build more battle ships, Great Britain, which seeks to have a navy equal to the maximum of any two powers, will prosecute her naval programme, keeping just as far in advance as now.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, with the kind consent of the committee, I should like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. No ministry in Great Britain, Conservative or Liberal, could abandon this policy of a navy as great as that of any other two nations. There is a strong sentiment there for peace, but not strong enough to prevail against that long-cherished plan. We would then be still further involved in the mad race for naval expansion, in expenditures which have already become too burdensome for endurance. We may safely say that, just as it is always darkest before day, so light is already beginning to peer through the darkness. Under more enlightened policies, which will surely prevail, the limitation of armaments will come by necessity in the very near future.

Now, as regards our becoming the world's peacemaker. What does the task of a peacemaker involve? It requires that when two countries are in or near to a conflict, we will say to them:

"You must settle your differences." If they do not agree upon a settlement such as we approve, then we must take the side of one or the other. That means war. It not only means war between us and one or the other, but it means that other nations will be involved in the conflict.

I want to call attention in this connection to a destructive argument in regard to the Monroe doctrine. It is said that we must have a larger navy. It is said that we could have prevented the trouble in Manchuria if we had possessed more battle ships. Anyone who will pause and reflect must realize that such intervention would mean an absolute abandonment of the Monroe doctrine. Its very fundamental principle was and is that the Old World must keep out of the New, because it does not belong to it, and the New World must keep out of the Old, because it does not belong there. So that when we begin to talk of a larger navy to compel nations to do our bidding to make peace, then we are getting away not only from the ancient moorings, from our policy of peace and nonintervention, but from our greatly prized Monroe doctrine.

The argument has been even carried so far as to suggest that it is necessary for us to have a larger navy in order to encourage the spread of the Gospel. How absurd that is! It would be saying to the peoples that do not embrace Christianity, "You have not accepted our religion. Now, we have a navy. We can burn your towns, slay innocent women and children; you had better accept our religion or a worse thing will come to you." Can anything be more contrary to the spirit of Christianity?

No. Let us continue our traditional policy, not indeed one of weakness, nor yet of nonresistance, but one of confidence in our strength as a nation. Our military strength, though mighty in its possibilities, is but a part; our material strength is much more; but most of all can we rely upon those great moral and political principles which have made our country what it is, the eternal principles of justice to all, the equality of man. Those great ideas are stronger than battle ships. Along those lines lie our destiny and our glory. We can already claim the position of the proudest and most progressive nation on the globe. How much more, in the coming years, by promoting peace and justice, can we conserve all the influences of the past and gain, in ever-increasing measure, the confidence, the good will, and the cooperation of all the nations of the earth! [Loud and long-continued applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may be allowed to proceed for fifteen minutes.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to the gentleman proceeding for fifteen minutes, but after that I shall object to any further discussion until we reach that paragraph in the bill upon which this discussion is more appropriate.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from New York is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet. I am disposed to object unless we are allowed—

The CHAIRMAN. There are no conditions in an objection. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. KEIFER. Well, I will withdraw my objection, with the understanding that I may have some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not have any such understanding.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, with the entire argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] I am in the most hearty accord. The message of the Commander in Chief, however, it seems to me, has placed a new aspect upon this entire question, which I desire to place before this House. As to a large part of that message—its arguments, the conclusions it draws from the facts of history—I take the position so ably stated by the gentleman from Ohio; but in that part of it where the Commander in Chief declares upon his solemn responsibility that the exigencies and requirements of the national defense demand the construction of these four battle ships, a question is submitted to us which it seems to me must be considered at closer range than that occupied by the gentleman from Ohio.

On every deduction that can be drawn from general historical facts I think the duty of this House is imperative to reach its own conclusions, giving to arguments proceeding from any source—whether it be the White House, this floor, or the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol—exactly the weight which in our judgment they deserve. But when the national defense is affected, we then reach a ground of vastly greater delicacy and much greater parliamentary difficulty. When the Commander in Chief declares that anything is essential to our defense, he being charged with peculiar responsibility for it, with

sources of information largely denied to us, it becomes our pressing duty to inquire whether there be anything in our situation, foreign or domestic, that justifies or even lends plausibility to his recommendation. If it be purely fanciful, we must of course dismiss it as the fruit of fanciful fears and apprehensions should be dismissed; but if there be anything in our situation that gives it point and effect, then, it seems to me, we are bound to remember the constitutional responsibility placed on him and our own duty to provide him with the means by which this the most important of his duties may be effectually discharged.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. COCKRAN. I have very little time. If the gentleman will wait until I conclude, I will welcome any questions.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It is right in that connection.

Mr. COCKRAN. No; I have only fifteen minutes at my disposal. I must ask the Chair to protect me from interruption now. I will answer the gentleman as fully as he may wish at the conclusion if he will get me additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] that there is no reason to apprehend danger from any foreign government. I repeat my profound regret that we ever abandoned the policy of peaceful, imposing isolation which the gentleman lauds in terms which it richly deserves.

I regret that we ever undertook the establishment of a permanent fighting force and abandoned that peaceful attitude from which we won a consequence in this world without parallel in the history of nations, when our word carried a weight vastly greater than ever armaments enforced, when we wielded an influence far beyond any that could have been established by force, entirely through the good character that we enjoyed. But we have undertaken the construction of the Navy, and I am sorry for it. While I would resist every attempt to increase it, but would gladly get rid of it if there were nothing but ordinary foreign complications to be apprehended, there is another aspect of the question which forces me to wholly different conclusions.

I agree that we have no possessions which any other nation covets. I agree that no other nation possesses anything which we desire, but none the less I discern a cloud upon our horizon which may easily grow until the entire sky over our heads be darkened. It is not a danger arising from anything that any foreign government plots or plans or meditates. It is a difficulty which I believe both the governments concerned are most anxious to avoid. Nevertheless it remains a serious menace to peace. I certainly would not vote for an appropriation that would launch us upon the ambitious mission of enforcing a world-wide peace sketched by the gallant gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] last Saturday. I deny that we have any right to enforce our notions of justice upon another country in a matter with which we have no direct concern. We have all that we can do in keeping ourselves from injuring others. Nations and men exhaust their capacity for good when they do justice themselves. [Applause.] Should we undertake to enforce our notions of justice on another country in a matter foreign to ourselves we would be attempting to establish complete authority over it.

If we directed Russia to vacate Manchuria, as was suggested here on Saturday, we would be asserting complete sovereignty over her. We could not do more than that if we had actually disarmed all her fighting force, demolished all her fortifications, taken possession of all her seaports. No nation could tolerate such pretensions on our part and maintain even a simulacrum of independence. I will never cast a vote for a policy that might launch us on such an enterprise of waste, ruin, and desolation, none the less disastrous in its fruits because it may be undertaken with lofty ideas of justice and morality.

But, Mr. Chairman, without engaging in foreign adventures, we have here upon our soil a question, a burning question, one that may involve us in the gravest difficulties at any moment in a most unexpected manner. We have two races dwelling on the Pacific coast.

The history of the world is absolutely without a single break in teaching the lesson that where two races come in contact there must be conflict unless one admits superiority of the other. We have had two races here in the South. There is peace, because one acknowledges superiority of the other, or at least superiority was asserted by one and the other has submitted. Wherever it is not conceded peacefully it will be asserted by one, and asserted by violence, until the other acknowledges it. I regret this myself. I had hoped that the virtues which the Japanese displayed before and after the Russian war, their

moderation in victory, their tender care for the captured and wounded, would establish a new footing for them in the eyes of their white brethren. I had even hoped respect for their qualities might have led to some plan or basis by which those highly intelligent laborers would be welcomed here, or at least suffered to come in contact with us for industry, they improving our resources by their labor, while vastly improving their own condition by the wages earned in this land. But recent events on the Pacific coast have dispelled these hopes finally, completely, irretrievably.

This country is the El Dorado of the Japanese. Their eyes are turned toward it. Many of them are here—many more are eager to come. But the people of the Pacific coast will not allow them to dwell there—at least on a basis of equality, and they accept no other. Now, everybody recognizes that. The President of the United States recognizes it. Everybody concedes there is only one peaceful outcome, and that is exclusion of the yellow man. But Japan refuses to make a treaty of exclusion, though it is an open secret that the Japanese Government has undertaken to prevent emigration of Japanese laborers to these shores. Practical exclusion is promised us, though the Japanese authorities do not venture to make a formal arrangement for exclusion, through fear of public opinion in their own land.

The President, I think, believes that if this practical exclusion can be secured it will meet all the requirements of the situation, because there being few women of that race in this country—if further influx can be prevented—at the end of nine or ten years the number of Japanese must become so diminished by natural causes that they would be a negligible quantity. But if the measures taken by the Japanese Government informally be not effective and the number of Japanese in this country continues to increase, then there must be an exclusion bill. The sentiment of the Pacific coast demands it. No other solution is possible. These yellow men will not be suffered to dwell upon the terms of equality on which they insist side by side with white men. Now, the passage of an exclusion bill, everybody knows, would be deemed an unfriendly act by the Japanese Government. Their ambassador would probably be withdrawn, and what is meant when the Japanese Government holds an act to be unfriendly and withdraws its diplomatic representative the world has learned through the experience of the last few years.

Mr. Chairman, here is a situation sufficiently grave to justify me in complying with any reasonable demand of the Executive for additional measures of defense. [Applause.] But that is not all. Hitherto we have been considering measures that the Government can control. Conceive this situation in some of its aspects that no government can control. To talk about peace being secure while that question remains acute on the Pacific coast is about as sensible as to assume that a man can be perfectly safe while standing over a powder magazine with a lighted torch in his hand. I can conceive a condition which every gentleman from the Pacific coast will tell you is neither unreasonable nor improbable and which might involve us overnight in the gravest complications.

Suppose a native of Japan should offer an indignity to a white woman on the Pacific coast. Does anybody doubt that, whatever might be the penalty demanded by local laws against that offense, public opinion would be satisfied with nothing less than a capital expiation? Does anybody believe that public opinion would even brook the delay incidental to judicial process? And that is not all. Suppose some person guilty of such a crime should escape and obtain shelter in a settlement of his own countrymen, who might seek to conceal him from judicial pursuit. Is it not conceivable that before the fury which would assuredly be awakened by such a crime and the apprehension that it might go unpunished the settlement itself might be exterminated?

I see a smile of incredulity upon the face of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TAWNEY]. Has he forgotten what occurred in New Orleans fifteen or sixteen years ago, when a number of Italians, white men, members of our own race though of a different family, who had been acquitted by a jury on a charge of murder, were taken by the populace and hanged?

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] doubt if a white woman were outraged by a yellow man that vengeance prompter than that of the New Orleans populace would follow swiftly, inexorably? Would not a more violent outbreak, in all probability, be provoked by this darker crime, for in this country the purity of woman is held sacred, even above human life. [Applause.]

Now, conceive such a catastrophe as I have suggested to have occurred. It is not an extravagant conception. Do you

believe it impossible that there would be reprisals in Tokyo or Yokohama? Do you think there is no danger of such a calamity? The Italian Government, after the New Orleans lynchings, withdrew its minister, practically breaking off diplomatic relations with us, until the question was settled by Mr. Blaine, and its settlement was one of the triumphs of his administration. But does anybody think Italy would have been satisfied with the tardy compensation made to the families of the victims if she had been strong enough to demand prompter and more radical reparation? And if the Italian people believed their Government strong enough to cope with us, is it impossible that they would have indulged in riotous demonstrations, possibly sacrificing American lives in Italian cities? Do you think the question would have been settled as peacefully and as consistently with civilization as Mr. Blaine succeeded in settling it if our superior strength had not rendered aggressive measures unthinkable?

The danger here is that this yellow race, jealous of its equality, believing itself to be quite on a par with the best of the white race, if such a disaster should supervene, would at once undertake reprisals—possibly for the purpose of forcing their own Government into hostilities. A Japanese mob might lay violent hands on some of our citizens—not American laborers, for there are none in Japan, but upon American citizens of consequence, possibly on our consul or our ambassador—and if violence were done to one of our representatives, do you think it would be possible then to undertake peaceful negotiations? The only way that danger can be averted is to satisfy the Japanese multitude by such a display of superior force at our command that we are too strong to be assailed, that violence under any circumstances to American representatives would but entail fresh humiliation on the perpetrators. Then there would be opportunity for reflection, negotiations, settlement on some basis of justice consistent with equity and our own dignity. I assume the President had this situation before his eyes when he penned this message.

At least, it is before my eyes, and realizing its importance, its gravity, all the tremendous possibilities involved in it, when the Commander in Chief declares that we need four additional ships of this character to maintain our security, I deplore the fact; I regret it. But I recognize the chief responsibility is his, as the exclusive knowledge is his, and I shall cast my vote to shift that burden of obligation from us, where it rests now, to his shoulders by affording him all the means of defense which he considers essential to the security of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I listen, Mr. Chairman, always with pleasure and often with great profit to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN].

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask what is pending before the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAINEY. The last two words.

Mr. FOSS. I understand that this has been discussed fifteen minutes upon each side, and I will have to object unless there is—

Mr. RAINEY. I have the floor, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. Without objection, the motion to strike out the last word will be withdrawn. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. RAINEY. I move to strike out the last two words. As I said, I often listen with great profit to the eloquence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. I admire his ability in the space of time of a few months to occupy exactly opposite positions upon the same subject. [Applause.]

Two years ago, sitting here in the House, I listened to a speech by the gentleman from New York. On the 16th day of May, 1906, there was pending here in the House the matter of building the first great American *Dreadnought*, and at that time the gentleman from New York spoke most eloquently against that proposition. Nothing has happened since then to change the status of affairs. There were just as many yellow men on the coast of California then as there are to-day. We were established in the islands of the sea then just as we are to-day. Since that time the President has sent to this House at least 150 messages [laughter], and not one of them affected the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] in the least, except the message that reached the House on yesterday advocating four battle ships. The gentleman for some reason was so much impressed by the fact that this one man out of the 85,000,000 of men in the United States had declared in favor of four battle ships that he at once reached the same conclusion. Now, I can

not make a better speech against this proposition than to read from the gentleman himself—from his remarks delivered in the House on the 16th day of May, 1906. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I read on page 6975 of the RECORD of the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, from the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. I never can hope to equal in eloquence the gentleman from New York, and therefore on this occasion I adopt his own speech.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] published a speech in the RECORD of the 10th, which had for its caption, "The man with the gun; is he an evil?" where, in rhetoric that is almost rhapsodical, he is painted as the hope of progress, the rampart of peace, the bulwark of civilization.

Reading that interesting effusion, I was struck with what seems to be a glaring injustice perpetrated, though quite unconsciously, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Why has he lavished all his praises on one exponent of force while excluding from the scope of his panegyric all other agents of violence? While he rejoices in the activity and hopes for the permanence of the man at the gun, why does he not lament the disappearance of "the man with the tomahawk," who may have been of less actual efficiency, but who was certainly of equal enthusiasm in the destruction of human life?

[Applause.]

Why does he begrudge a word of praise to "the man with the bludgeon," whom people less enlightened than the gentleman from Pennsylvania send to jail or the scaffold when in the exercise of his activities he beats or kills a traveler on the public highway? Why is the gentleman forgetful of "the man with the brass knuckles," who, though he does not rise to the dignity of homicide, is yet deeply convinced that peace is demoralizing, and who, though he does not often destroy his neighbor's life, yet always does his humble but diligent best to reduce the pulchritude of his neighbor's countenance?

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that notwithstanding the carefully studied language employed by its supporters it is the spirit of savagery that has been let loose in support of this proposal to construct the biggest engine of destruction in the world.

[Applause.]

Not one single argument has been advanced to the reason or intelligence of this House. There is but one redeeming feature in all this rhetoric. It shows that this country is still governed by a strong love of peace, since the men who favor building this battle ship pretend it is intended not for aggression, but for defense. But, sir, this assertion is more creditable to their ingenuity than to their candor.

[Applause.]

Defense against whom? Where is the foe that menaces us? The transparent character of this pretense becomes obvious the moment we examine it. In the face of this action, any attempt on our part to take the lead in a movement for peace becomes extravagant and farcical. How can we pretend to be sincerely desirous of peace while we are taking the lead in constructing machinery of war? The gentleman from Missouri apparently believes that we can establish peace upon the basis of eloquence; that while we are multiplying the engines of war we can become effective agents for peace merely by professing attachment to it. If peace can be established upon the basis of eloquence, we have but to send him to attend an international conference and the white dove will spread her wings over this continent and all the civilized world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. I hope I may have leave to read the remainder of this.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRAN. I hope there will be no objection.

The CHAIRMAN (after a pause). The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY. I continue to read from the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]:

Does anyone suppose that in view of our experience any nation of the world would take these islands from us as a gift? If they ever do go to another power, then I pray it may be to mine enemy. What else do we possess which any other power would accept even as a free gift? Does anyone suppose that if we offered to present a State of this Union, or one of our Territories, to any nation in the world, the offer would be accepted? And if there be nothing on the surface of this globe which we possess that any other nation desires, is there anything possessed by any other nation that we covet, that we would take by force of arms, or that we would be willing to accept? About what, then, can we ever go to war? On what ground can anyone assail us, or are we likely to attack any other power? What, then, in the name of common sense, becomes of the pretense that this increase of armament by the addition of an enormous battle ship is necessary to our defense? I admit a certain force in the appeal to imagination and national pride when we are urged to place among our possessions anything which is the biggest of its kind on earth. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat sensible to an appeal of that character myself. This is the biggest country in the world, and the biggest things proper to the sphere in which she moves are her natural possessions and her suitable adornment.

I want the biggest things on earth in every field where our history, our tradition, our civilization invites us to compete for preeminence. I would like to see the largest engine of production developed by American genius. I abhor the thought that we would engage in a competition to produce the most effective engine of destruction. What is there that would justify us in arming against our neighbors? I ask once more, gentlemen on the other side, especially the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW], since there is no thirst for territory on our part to gratify or on the part of any other nation that we are concerned to resist. I pause for an answer. There is none and there can be none. Some gentlemen talk vaguely about an open door in China, as though we could institute an active and prosperous commerce with a 12-inch gun. Some gentlemen seem to think that if we want to sell goods in the East an American war ship must be near by, but I don't think anyone seriously believes war ships can be turned into vessels for transporting freight.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRAN. Had the trouble about the schools in San Francisco taken place before that speech was made or since?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not think there ever was anything in the trouble about the schools.

Mr. COCKRAN. But the race question was accentuated by that very disturbance.

Mr. RAINEY. We have had a race question on the Pacific coast ever since the first Chinaman landed there and taught Americans how to play poker [long continued laughter], and it is no more serious now than it has always been.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask that the gentleman may have time to read one other sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY. I read again from the same speech:

Does anybody believe that force can play any part in peaceful commerce? Do not gentlemen realize that to the extent we waste our national treasure in constructing these destructive engines we withdraw it from the productive enterprises which are the legitimate fields of peaceful and profitable competition between civilized men?

Before sitting down I ask any gentleman on the other side to point out one single tangible, comprehensible reason why our Navy should be increased. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have to-day a navy far in excess of our needs; certainly a navy far in excess of any need that has been pointed out upon that side. I would like to know if there be any reason which this debate has not disclosed that could justify such an increase as the one proposed by this bill in our naval armament?

And again I read from the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]:

Mr. VREELAND. I desire the gentleman to state during the remainder of his time how large a navy, in the opinion of the gentleman, the United States ought to maintain, if any.

Mr. COCKRAN. I will answer very frankly, Mr. Chairman, that a navy equal to that which was strong enough to force arbitration upon reluctant England after the close of our civil war, when our credit was so low that gold commanded a high premium in our currency, would be, in my judgment, a big enough navy now, when we have no question to settle and no powerful country to coerce, either by moral or physical force.

I regret that I do not have the time to read this entire speech, but I have read enough of it to show that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] has without much provocation changed his mind on this question. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto in ten minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask the gentleman to make it fifteen minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that all debate upon the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. FOSS. I will make it fifteen minutes. I wish, first, to say that we have not yet reached the paragraph for the increase of the Navy. When that is reached there will be opportunity for more debate. I renew my motion to close debate in fifteen minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, neither I nor any other man in the United States acquainted with recent history was at all astonished at the reading of the President's message. He has taught the doctrine that war develops manlike virtues and that peace is a sloth breeder. It is nothing new for him to speak in this vein. None of us is, of course, astonished at the position occupied by my young friend and colleague, Captain HOBSON. We expected that. He is a young enthusiast. He is an expert along certain lines. His mind has been entirely absorbed in thought along those lines, and he is entirely absorbed in them yet. He is like an agrostologist or entomologist in the Department of Agriculture, who could prove to you any hour of the day that all the money spent by the Department might be properly spent in the encouragement of grass growing—and the man believes it.

And, moreover, in a certain sense, if the world had no use for any money for any other reason, what he says would be true, too. Men of that sort, Mr. Speaker, always remind me of the story of the man who came home a little the worse for wear, and his wife awakening him later in the night when, hearing a great rush of winds upon the outside, became fearful that a cyclone was approaching. After succeeding in waking him, she requested him to go to the door and look out and report what the weather appearances were. By mistake, instead of going to the door that opened upon the gallery, he went to a door that opened into a closet in which some limburger cheese had been placed. His wife still interrogating him, he finally replied: "Betty, I

don't know what is the matter, but everything is as dark as the dickens and smells like cheese." [Laughter.] Take one of these enthusiasts of that description and of course everything is pessimistic to him. We have not got a perfect navy, and he wants one. He is like an eye specialist. God never made an eye to suit an eye specialist. God never made a nose to suit a nose specialist. God never made a throat to suit a throat specialist, and God never built a navy big enough and good enough to suit an enthusiastic young retired lieutenant. [Laughter and applause.] But, Mr. Chairman, while I was astonished at neither of these gentlemen, I must confess myself somewhat appalled by the speech I just listened to from "the grave and reverend signior" who is now a Representative from the State of New York, my friend Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. COCKRAN says that "the Commander in Chief" having recommended that, therefore we ought to take his advice. The gentleman from New York is mistaken about the President's title. The President is "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States," not Commander in Chief of the Congress of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] He says that the President having declared on his solemn responsibility that the national preservation does require four battle ships, he concludes himself, as a Representative, by that. I declare "upon my solemn responsibility" that the preservation of the United States does not require four battle ships. What is the difference between the solemn responsibilities of the two, Have not I a right to be solemn and have not I a responsibility as well as the President of the United States? [Applause and laughter.] Why do I declare it? Because all this picture, evoked from the misty clouds, is nothing in the world but the product of a frightened imagination; that is all. You can get to thinking about the danger of anything—

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a moment. You can get to thinking about the danger of anything until you can not see anything but that. Go out and study what the white plague, tuberculosis, is doing, and think of nothing else, and see how much you want to appropriate to prevent it.

[The time of Mr. WILLIAMS having expired, by unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MADDEN, it was extended ten minutes.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCKRAN. Does the gentleman really contend that if the exclusion of the Japanese be not established by some way or other, that a very serious question is not before us?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am coming to that in a minute. I had not reached it yet. I preferred to discuss this question first. But, Mr. Chairman, I am not bound by the President's opinion as to what constitutes a sufficient national defense. These gentlemen, who are advocating four battle ships, arrogate to themselves the rôle of being those who "wish to provide a sufficient national defense." Why, there is nobody on the other side of that proposition. The only proposition is what constitutes a sufficient national defense, and in answering that question they consider nothing but our Army and Navy; but I, like the gentleman from Ohio, consider our 85,000,000 people, our broad land, our continental isolation, the necessity of our food and textile stuff to all Europe, our resources, and the facts that we not only have them, but the fact that all the world knows that we have them, and that any ministry in England or upon the Continent would be composed of fools that would seek a quarrel in any manner with the great reserve powers of this great Republic of Republics.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I suppose according to the logic of the gentleman from New York, if the President sent word here "upon his solemn responsibility as Commander in Chief" that we needed a million men for national defense there could be no sitting in judgment on his opinion. You and I would simply have to say, "Of course, Caesar having said it, and Caesar being Commander in Chief, that settles it." [Laughter and applause.] That will not lead me to burden the farmers and mechanics of this country with this great additional taxation merely to provide avenues of promotion for gentlemen in the Navy.

Now, I come to the question of the Japanese immigration. We can keep out Japanese immigration better than by virtually declaring on the floor of the House of Representatives, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] this morning has done, that we are providing expenditures in preparation of war with Japan. Do you want to put her on notice that we are expecting war with her and tell her that she had better get ready, too, because we are getting ready? You ask me how we are going to stop Japanese immigration. It is being stopped now by the sagacity and good sense of the Japanese Government and its people. Japan wants no trouble with the United

States. Why, some gentlemen seem to think that she has designs on us in the Philippines and elsewhere. Some gentlemen seem to think that she is merely waiting for a pretext to declare war, to take advantage of any mob or even a rape and a lynching, as we have heard this morning, that might possibly occur in California, or a quarrel about school children. I say that if she had been seeking that pretext she had it and could have embraced it before our Navy was in the Pacific Ocean, and when she knew that she was far superior to us there in every respect.

What is Japan's problem? She has lately taken over Korea, and her problem is now to consolidate her sovereignty and fix her power in the country by Japanese industrial colonization and build it up and also act as a safety valve that it may at some time relieve her of her surplus population. What is then her policy? It is to sacrifice nearly everything, except national honor—and then only when brought nearly to the straining point—to keep peace with the two great English-speaking people of the world, one, Great Britain, which has the largest navy in the world, and the other, ourselves, having the second largest navy in the world. [Applause.]

She must keep open communication between her island empire and the mainland; she must have time to work out these new problems. She has already effected an alliance with Great Britain, and she knows that we never propose to be absurd enough to interfere with her programme on the mainland in China. Nobody in the White House, if we selected one out of a lunatic asylum, would be absurd enough to think that he could transport across the miles of watery waste of the Pacific Ocean men enough of the American Army to contend with the Japanese army on land there. So we by force of circumstances will be quiescent unless we are forced into trouble, and so she is working out her problems which will be replete with great benefit to civilization when they are worked out.

But some things in the President's message strike me as curious. In substance he says now we have nothing to fear from anybody and nobody has anything to fear from us and therefore we ought to load up our hip pocket with a six shooter. [Laughter.]

We ought to go on, because nobody has anything that we want and we have nothing that anybody else wants; we ought to go prepared for war because we are expecting peace. I am tired, anyhow, of this everlasting nonsense that the best way to maintain peace is to prepare for war. [Applause.] This has ever been the pretense of militarism. I am tired of hearing that the best thing to do in times of peace is "to prepare for war!" I will tell you the best thing to do in times of peace. It is to prepare for more and longer and better and more stable and more intelligent peace. [Applause.] Away with this jingoism and the jingoes that go as incidents with it. Revert to the real American character and principle. The Monroe doctrine needs a fleet to support it! Where did the Monroe doctrine spring from? From a British cabinet. It was suggested to America from the British cabinet. Why? Because Great Britain wanted the United States to stand as lords protectors against changes of sovereignty in America, and against the reconquest by Spain to free peoples in South and Central America. She was working for her selfish interests while she put to us our selfish and national interests of hegemony in the matter also, and now we do stand there saying to the world, "We will permit no new conquests on American territory, and we will permit no changes of European sovereignty there." Thus the Monroe doctrine protects every island that Great Britain, or France, or Denmark, has in the Western Hemisphere, and if the United States threw it up to-morrow and said "We will have no more of it," Great Britain would have to assert it in her own interests.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. Would the gentleman stand for having America abandon the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, how could the gentleman arrive at that conclusion from anything that I have said? I have merely said it did not take ships to defend it. I have merely said that as an ally in protecting it we necessarily have Great Britain herself, that has now and will for long have the largest sea power of the world. We have protected it hitherto because other peoples were not afraid of the little American Army and the little American Navy, but they were afraid of the great American people, with their enormous resources and undoubted courage, genius, and determination. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this paragraph has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. HOBSON. If the gentleman would not—

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Debate has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I ask unanimous consent for one minute to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this paragraph has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to answer it if I had the time, provided I could.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

That, for the purpose of further increasing the naval establishment of the United States, the President is hereby authorized to have constructed, by contract or in navy-yards, as hereinafter provided, two first-class battle ships to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$6,000,000 each, similar in all essential characteristics to the battle ship authorized by the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 2, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "four," so that it will read, "four first-class battle ships."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TAWNEY. For the purpose of offering an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, to strike out the word "two," in line 2, and insert the word "one."

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent that general debate may be had upon this paragraph and all pending amendments thereto for two hours and a half. I will put it in this form. I will ask that all amendments on this paragraph may be considered as pending, and move to close debate thereon upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto in two hours and a half.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. For the purpose of asking the gentleman from Illinois whether if consent be given as now requested by him—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands that he is proceeding by unanimous consent?

Mr. FOSS. Entirely.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Ohio to let me complete the question that I was about to put to the Chair.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves that all debate close on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto in two hours and a half.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If the motion now put to the Chair is debated, will that prevent my offering an amendment that I desire to offer to the pending paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not. Amendments may be offered and there will be no debate upon them after the two and a half hours.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, another parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If the debate upon the proposition offered by the gentleman from Alabama should take up the two and a half hours will there be opportunity to discuss an amendment which I now propose to offer, that one battle ship be built in one of the navy-yards of the Government?

The CHAIRMAN. If the motion of the gentleman from Illinois prevails all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto will expire in two and one-half hours.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I desire to ask whether if consent is given to the request of the gentleman from Illinois—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not ask unanimous consent—

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, if the motion prevails, I desire to know if debate will proceed under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. It will.

Mr. FOSS. And the Chair will have the disposal of the time.

Mr. KELIHER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELIHER. I want to inquire of the Chair if the motion of the gentleman from Illinois prevails and this paragraph is amended will an amendment to the amended paragraph be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state if the motion of the gentleman from Illinois prevails, this paragraph will be pending for discussion in the House under the five-minute rule for two hours and a half. Any gentleman may in his time, if he secures the floor, read an amendment and have it pending, but at the expiration of two and a half hours any amendment that is offered will be voted upon without debate.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I am the junior member of this body. I have made no pretense as to any merits, any virtues whatsoever. I believe that the gentleman from Mississippi might perhaps wait to judge me by my actions before he begins his patronizing, and I believe the gentleman from Ohio might wait similar action before he begins his rebukes. Just four years ago, almost to the day, in the city of Jasper, Ala., the then senior Democratic member on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors told the woodpecker story, and said that young man reminded him of the woodpecker that lit on an oak tree and a storm came and blew the oak tree down, and the woodpecker went out, with his tail cocked up, believing that he had blown it over. I ventured to suggest to the gentleman to wait to be sure and find out whether instead of its being the woodpecker it was not the storm that was after him.

I venture to ask the gentleman from Mississippi to wait and see whether he went into the closet or actually went out into the cyclone, and I begin by asking him and the gentleman from Ohio to do me the justice to discuss what I propose in my amendment, and not attribute to me things which I have not given them the authority to attribute. The proposition here in this amendment is not for a navy that can conquer and dominate the world. The proposition is for four first-class battle ships. The proposition before the German Parliament, which has been adopted, is for four first-class battle ships—that is, three battle ships and one great armored cruiser. The proposition before the French Chamber of Deputies is for six great battle ships, and the proposition before the Chamber of Japan is for an addition to the two laid down this year of seven more.

Will those gentlemen tell me whether, with this nation already far behind the others—only two building when Germany has five building, only two building when France has six building, only two building when Japan has completed two and is building two more; that with this nation that controls seventeen billions of the world's banking capital as compared with only about five billions for the British Empire all told, and that is the richest of the other nations; this nation with 50,000 miles of coast line on the Atlantic Ocean compared with the British with 2,200, the French with 1,700, and Germany with 800 miles; this nation with nearly 40,000 miles of coast line on the Pacific as compared with 13,000 of Japan; this nation that has thirty-seven billions of its property within gunshot of the water, more than all the rest of the world combined—whether I am rushing headlong, pellmell, going out to conquer and dominate the world, when I introduce an amendment here which not only does not maintain our nation at its present relative strength but which will make our nation go backward, even if there were no other ocean but the Atlantic Ocean to take care of? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for fifteen minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to know whether that is coming out of the two hours and a half or not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the consent has been granted. The Chair waited a reasonable length of time for objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, to authorize four new battle ships would mean an increase for naval construction of \$48,000,000 and \$4,000,000 annually for maintenance when these vessels are placed in commission. The authorization of two battle ships would mean an increased expenditure for new construction of \$24,000,000 and \$2,000,000 annually for maintenance. The addition of the proposed four new battle ships would make our aggregate expenditures on account of the Navy next year greater than the expenditures of any country in the world for that purpose in any one year. This is no exaggeration and is not made for the purpose of exciting alarm. I have carefully analyzed the Army and Navy budgets of the United States, England, France, Germany, and Japan, and I am able, by a comparison of the expenditures for the purpose by each country named, to show that in proportion to the size of our Army and Navy we are expending this year more than 100 per cent in excess of the expenditures of any other country in the world for the same purposes, and that no nation in the world approaches our expenditures on account of wars past and wars to come.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. I must decline to yield now. I will yield later to the gentleman.

But the House and the country should understand that the opposition to this ambitious, mistaken naval policy of four battle ships, or two battle ships each year, is not based entirely upon the aggregate cost in either case. While I shall vote for one battle ship, there is much that could be said in opposition to the authorization of that one.

Navies are built and maintained for national defense. They are not intended and can not be justified upon the ground that they are necessary to satisfy an ambition, either personal or national, to compete with other nations in time of peace in size and number of fighting machines. In this country the prestige and power of the nation does not depend upon the size of our Army or the size of our Navy. There is no policy of our Government, either foreign or domestic, to enforce which the size of either is the first or the only essential. We have 80,000,000 of patriotic people. It is in them and their patriotism that the strength of our nation exists, and not in our standing army or our permanent naval establishment. In the future, as in the past, the strength of our policies and the ability of our Government to enforce them will be measured by ourselves and by foreign nations, not by the size of our Army or our Navy, but by the resources, the patriotism, and the loyalty of our people, who are known throughout the world to be ready and willing at any and all times to sacrifice their property, aye, even their lives, in the defense of their Government and its beneficent institutions.

We should not, therefore, encourage our people to surrender to militarism that self-reliance, that consciousness of superior individual national strength upon which as a nation they have always relied, by teaching them to rely upon a standing army and a navy in time of peace large enough to be capable of successfully competing with the armies and the navies of the world, or any one of them, in time of war.

If it is not to gratify an ambition to excel other nations in the size and number of big battle ships that we are now asked to depart from the policy declared two years ago of authorizing but one big battle ship each year, what, then, is it that prompts this proposed change in that policy? Will anyone claim there is reason to apprehend war with any foreign nation within the next decade? If there is, the information upon which that apprehension is based has been carefully withheld from the legislative branch of the Government. [Applause.] If there is, then why is our magnificent fleet of sixteen battle ships, with its foreign auxiliary ships, now sailing in the Pacific, soon to start upon a naval parade around the world, leaving our Pacific and our Atlantic coasts exposed and defenseless for a period of almost a year? [Applause.] This fact proves not alone that the proposed competitive naval policy is prompted by an ambition to excel other nations in the size and number of our big battle ships, but it also proves that those who advocate this policy realize the tremendous advantage we enjoy by reason of our magnificent geographical isolation. [Applause.]

Are we, in appropriating the money of the people for our national defense, to entirely ignore our splendid geographical isolation? Are we to entirely ignore the physical facts that make it practically impossible, with the modern means of warfare, for any nation to invade our territory or come within range of our coast line without being intercepted by the means of defense we now have at our command? If our isolation enables us to dispense with our Navy as a means of national defense for almost a year, why are we not justified in relying upon that isolation and the Navy we now have, when that Navy is

at home and available as an additional means of defense. [Applause.]

The transport service of no European nation is sufficient, even without opposition, to land upon American soil an army of 100,000 men at a given time. There is no country in the Orient that has a naval base within reaching distance of our Pacific coast, and no oriental nation would be so reckless of its own interests as to risk the loss of its navy or its fleet by attempting to send it past the Hawaiian Islands for the purpose of attacking us upon the Pacific coast. It would know what is plain to every mind, that without having a naval base between its home ports and the object of its attack, and without its vessels being able to stop somewhere and coal and repair they would never return. In time of war the ports of every country in the world are closed to the navies of the contending nations, and each one of the combatants is driven to rely upon its own ports for supplies and for the means of carrying on naval warfare.

Mr. TALBOTT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question there?

Mr. TAWNEY. I decline to yield. Men talk about the thousand miles of American coast line and the danger which threatens us in consequence of its extent, as though that coast line were marked by an old worm fence and our enemies in time of war would occupy the land on the opposite side and invade American soil with all the ease with which the cows of one farmer break into the pasture of another. [Applause.] Why, gentlemen, our geographical isolation is an asset of our nation far more valuable as a means of national defense than all the navies we can build. No nation, European or oriental, would be reckless enough to risk the loss of its army and navy by attempting to invade our soil or come within range of our coast batteries.

But, Mr. Chairman, recent events have demonstrated that we have in the past pursued a bungling naval policy, one that is absolutely inexcusable. Notwithstanding the hundreds of millions of dollars we have expended during the last decade in the construction of our Navy, we to-day know that because our lack of auxiliary vessels our Navy is woefully deficient as a practical fighting organization. We seem to have proceeded upon the theory that all our nation demands or expects is the building of the biggest battle ships in order to gratify a boyish ambition to have something other nations do not possess, or we have proceeded on the theory that the mere building of these great fighting machines would have the effect of affording protection by scaring the other fellows.

Every American citizen who has been looking upon the growth of our Navy with patriotic pride has recently been humiliated by the fact that our splendid fleet of sixteen battle ships could not even start or successfully make the voyage in which it is now engaged, and which it might be called upon in time of war to make, without the aid of at least twenty-eight auxiliary vessels flying a foreign flag. A more disgraceful national spectacle was never witnessed by our people than this. It is the result of our pursuing the policy in respect to the upbuilding of our Navy, of giving almost exclusive attention to the building of battle ships and cruisers, and entirely ignoring the fact that in time of war they are valueless unless they have a full complement of auxiliary vessels to accompany them and supply them with the means absolutely essential to their existence and their effectiveness in time of war. It may be that this mistake is due to the fact that the necessary auxiliary vessels, though as essential to the efficiency of the Navy as a battle ship, are not so attractive, do not involve the expenditure of so much money, and do not afford the opportunity for the same pyrotechnic display upon the ocean or at the summer resorts along the coast. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, for that reason we have made the mistake of building a Navy that to-day, in order to make the voyage from ocean to ocean, is obliged to rely upon auxiliary vessels belonging to foreign nations. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a statement of the annual expenditures of the United States, England, France, and Germany in preparation for war, including the size of the army and navy of each country, the expenditures for their army and navy, administration, maintenance, and new construction; also a statement of the amount of revenue collected in 1907 by England, France, Germany, and the amount of revenue collected and estimated in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, which I desire to present for the information of the House. It is only fair that I should say that the details upon which this statement is based were prepared by Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, the chief bibliographer of the Congressional Library, one of the ablest statisticians in the public service, from the military and naval budgets of the countries named, which are on file in that Library.

Mr. Chairman, this statement is a very interesting one to

those who are paying some attention to the amount of money our Government is to-day expending in preparing for war and on account of past wars. It shows that this current fiscal year we are expending \$204,122,855 on account of preparations for war, or about twenty-nine millions more than we have expended in the construction of public buildings since the beginning of the Government, exclusive of public buildings in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota have five minutes further.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Is it not a fact that England—

Mr. TAWNEY. I will state, Mr. Chairman, that in five minutes—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. TAWNEY. Having but five minutes, I must decline to yield. I can not go into the full details, but I have a summary of these expenditures, which I will read, and I think I can do it in five minutes' time.

A comparison of the amounts expended by the United States this year on account of preparation for war with the amounts expended for the same purpose by England, France, Germany, and Japan, together with a statement of the relative strength of the army and navy of these countries, is worthy of most careful consideration on the part of every Member of this House, and should also be considered by the people whose money is thus appropriated and expended for destructive purposes.

Expended by the United States on account of preparation for war, fiscal year 1908.

Number of men in the Army	52,000
Total appropriations for American Army	\$101,599,462.22
Number of men in Navy	42,000
Number of vessels in Navy	51
Total appropriations on account of American Navy, 1908	\$102,523,393.35
Total to be expended by the United States on account of preparation for war	\$204,122,855.57
Actual and estimated revenue (exclusive of postal receipts) for 1908	\$574,000,000.00
Percentage of revenue for 1908 expended by United States on account of preparation for war	36.5

Expended by England on account of preparation for war, 1906.

Number of men in British army, exclusive of those serving in India	204,300
Appropriations on account of English army	\$121,232,201.15
Number of men in navy	129,000
Number of vessels in navy	185
Appropriations on account of English navy	\$149,364,556.75
Total expenditures by England, 1906, on account of preparation for war	\$270,596,757.90
Total revenues for 1906	\$704,737,686.26
Percentage of total revenue for 1906 expended by England that year on account of preparation for war	38.4

Expended by France on account of preparation for war, 1906.

Number of men in army, and authorized, including metropolitan and colonial troops	550,000
Appropriation on account of French army	\$138,707,340.23
Number of men in navy	56,285
Number of vessels in navy	77
Appropriation on account of French navy	\$62,732,182.88
Total expenditures by France, 1907, on account of preparation for war	\$201,439,523.11
Total French revenues, 1907	\$715,883,610.08
Percentage of total revenues for 1907 expended by France in preparation for war	28.00

Expended by Germany, 1906, on account of preparation for war.

Number of men in Germany army and authorized	609,000
Appropriations on account of Germany army	\$176,842,187.20
Number of men in navy	48,000
Number of vessels in navy	62
Appropriations on account of German navy	\$63,165,747.40
Total expenditures by Germany, 1907, on account of preparation for war	\$240,007,934.60
Total German revenues, 1907	\$617,941,200.80
Percentage of total revenues for 1907 expended by Germany on account of preparation for war	41.4

From the Secretary of the Navy I have obtained the following information regarding the Japanese budget for 1907-8:

Total ordinary, extraordinary, and supplemental budgets for years 1907 and 1908, 616,440,000 yen or approximately	\$308,220,000
Of this amount the ordinary and extraordinary expenditures on account of the army were 111,616,000 yen or approximately	55,808,000
And for the ordinary and extraordinary expenditures on account of the navy department, 82,481,000 yen or approximately	41,240,500
And for the war and navy departments combined, 194,097,000 yen or approximately	97,048,500

Total expended by these countries in preparation for war:

United States	\$204,122,855.57; per cent of revenues, 36.5
England	270,596,757.90; per cent of revenues, 38.4
France	201,439,523.11; per cent of revenues, 28.0
Germany	240,007,934.60; per cent of revenues, 41.4
Japan	97,048,500.00

Statement of the aggregate annual expenditure by the United States, England, Germany, and France on account of past wars, including all objects for which expenditures are made on that account and the percentage of the revenue of each country expended for these purposes in the years 1906 and 1908:

United States, 1908.....	\$180, 678, 204. 00
Percentage of revenue, exclusive of postal receipts.....	31. 00
England, 1906.....	\$29, 329, 063. 92
Percentage of revenues.....	0. 41
France, 1906.....	\$30, 501, 600. 00
Percentage of revenues.....	0. 42
Germany, 1906.....	\$8, 725, 496. 02
Percentage of revenues.....	0. 015

Total expended by these countries in preparation for war and on account of past wars:

United States.....	\$384, 801, 059. 57; per cent of revenues, 67. 5
England.....	299, 925, 821. 82; per cent of revenues, 42. 5
France.....	231, 941, 123. 11; per cent of revenues, 32. 2
Germany.....	248, 733, 220. 62; per cent of revenues, 42. 9

These figures show that on account of preparation for war the United States, with an Army of 52,000 men and a Navy of 42,000 men, is expending this year only \$66,473,701.18 less than England, with an army of 204,300 men and a navy of 129,000 men.

That the United States is expending for this purpose only \$35,884,869.03 less than Germany, with her army of 600,000 and her navy of 62,000 men.

That the United States is expending for this purpose in excess of the amount expended by France, with her army of 550,000 men and her navy of 56,285 men, \$2,683,332.46.

A further comparison of the sums expended by these countries on account of preparation for war and on account of past wars shows the startling fact that we are expending more than any other nation in the world for both objects named. We are this year expending \$84,975,238.75 more than England, \$136,067,838.95 more than Germany, and \$152,859,936.46 more than France.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, how long will the American people acquiesce in this extravagant expenditure for destructive purposes? We are to-day excelling any nation in the world. If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson], our naval budget authorized at this session of Congress will exceed in amount the naval budget of any other country in the world. And let me say here that for the past three years England has been reducing her expenses both in respect to the army and in respect to her navy. The Admiralty have recommended or estimated this year for only one *Dreadnought*—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Instead of four?

Mr. TAWNEY. Instead of four, as stated by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON rose.

Mr. TAWNEY. That statement is not made upon hearsay or upon newspaper information, but it is made from the naval estimates submitted at this session of Parliament, a copy of which I hold in my hand, having obtained it from the Congressional Library. And in addition to that, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

Mr. HOBSON. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Minnesota may be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAWNEY. In support of the proposition that this policy of increasing the Navy by the building of nothing but big battle ships is the result of an ambition on the part of the great naval powers of the world to excel each other, I will quote what the premier of England said last month in the debate on the naval budget in the House of Commons:

Mr. Asquith on Monday pronounced, perhaps unwittingly, a solemn condemnation of what was done three years ago—

It was at that time when they laid the keel of the first great *Dreadnought*—

when he said: "We do not wish to take a lead, but we want to do everything in our power to prevent a new spurt in competitive shipbuilding between the great naval powers."

Mr. Chairman, from this statement of the premier of England, when discussing the naval budget for the next fiscal year, which

is now under consideration in the Parliament of England, we see that the greatest naval power of the world practically admits, through its premier and by proposing to authorize only one battle ship for the next year, its mistake when it adopted the policy five years ago of establishing a new standard in the size of great battle ships, and that now that nation proposes to do everything in its power to prevent the further extension of this policy of competitive shipbuilding between the great naval powers of the world. If England, situated as she is geographically, with all of her great interests extending through other European countries, can afford to do this, how much more can the United States afford to do the same, instead of doing as is proposed by the Naval Committee and by the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson], taking "a new spurt in competitive shipbuilding" as between ourselves and other nations, and thus check the tendency, not only in our country but in other countries of the world, toward this extravagant expenditure in preparation for wars which, in my judgment, will never come.

I submit that neither the revenues of the Government nor the necessities of our national defense demand any increase whatever in our Navy or demand any change in the policy adopted a year ago of authorizing but one battle ship each year. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt and continue this ambitious competitive naval policy, how long will it be before the American people, in order to meet the increasing expenditures on account of this policy and the maintenance of our Navy, will be compelled to change their system of Federal taxation by adding to the indirect system, which has always obtained in time of peace, the system of direct taxation. Our national expenditures are increasing by leaps and bounds. Only sixteen years ago the country was startled by the fact that our expenditures had reached \$500,000,000 annually, while to-day our national expenditures are at the rate of almost \$100,000,000 a month, or a billion dollars every year.

In view of this fact and in view also of our diminishing revenues under our present system of indirect taxation, and in view, too, of the entire absence of any danger of war with any foreign nation as well as of our splendid geographical isolation, I submit that the representatives of the people here upon this floor are not justified in adding \$50,000,000 more to this naval appropriation bill for the purpose of gratifying either an individual or a national ambition to excel other nations in the size and number of great battle ships. [Applause.]

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has taken a large portion of the time that was yielded to him for the purpose of my asking him a question.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. I want to ask the gentleman if last year he did not predict a deficit of \$100,000,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. I did.

Mr. HOBSON. And didn't the gentleman miss it by about \$190,000,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. In answer to that—

Mr. HOBSON. There was a surplus of \$90,000,000—

Mr. TAWNEY. One moment. The gentleman can not put a question into my mouth and answer it at the same time. In answer to the gentleman from Alabama I will say that the prediction of one hundred millions deficit was made long before the close of Congress, upon the theory that if the appropriations asked for were granted there would be that deficit. I am glad to say that all these appropriations were not granted. We managed to keep them down, so that instead of a deficit appearing at the end of the last session we showed an estimated surplus of about \$25,000,000, based on estimated revenues. But, Mr. Chairman, while I estimated at the close of the last session a surplus of \$25,000,000, and was justified in doing so on the basis of the receipts of the Government at that time, we are to-day confronted with a deficit of \$60,000,000 at the close of this fiscal year. If the naval policy proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] prevails, our deficit at the end of the next fiscal year will reach the enormous sum of \$150,000,000. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record detailed statements of war expenditures by the United States and the other countries I have named.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by the insertion of certain tables. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Appropriations made at the last session of the Fifty-ninth Congress for the fiscal year 1908 on account of preparation for wars.

Army appropriation act	\$78,634,582.75
For the Army, urgent deficiency act, first session Sixtieth Congress, for the year 1908	3,363,628.44
Military Academy act	1,929,703.42
For the Military Academy, urgent deficiency act, first session Sixtieth Congress, for the year 1908	2,518.61
For armories and arsenals, urgent deficiency act, first session Sixtieth Congress, for the year 1908	4,050.00
For armories and arsenals, sundry civil appropriation act	636,093.00
For military posts, sundry civil appropriation act	2,141,875.00
For the War Department, legislative act	1,934,000.00

Total	88,646,451.22
Expended during fiscal year 1908 on account of Army and militia under permanent annual appropriations, as follows:	
Permanent militia	\$2,000,000
United States Soldiers' Home, District of Columbia	600,000
Pay Army deposit fund	1,000,000
Transportation, Army, Pacific Railway account	150,000
Ordnance material sales	75,000
New arms and equipment, organized militia	75,000
Navy, ordnance material sales	75,000
Naval Hospital fund	400,000
Clothing and small stores fund	1,000,000
Navy pay deposit fund	600,000
Navy transportation, Pacific Railway account	80,000
Percentage of entire revenues, 1½	\$6,055,000.00
Fortifications appropriations act	6,898,011.00
Naval appropriations act	\$98,143,000.00
For the Navy Department, legislative act	786,770.00
For the naval establishment, urgent deficiency act, first session, Sixtieth Congress, for the year 1908	3,593,623.35

Actual and estimated revenues for 1908, \$574,000,000.
War, 36½ per cent.

Appropriations made at the last session of the Fifty-ninth Congress for the fiscal year 1908 on account of wars.

Pensions	\$146,143,000.00
Board of Pensions Appeals	56,500.00
Pension Office salaries	1,073,250.00
Pension, special examiners, salaries and per diem	462,500.00
Pension Office, salaries, deficiency	None.
Deficiency, Army and Navy pensions	1,000,000.00
Artificial limbs	120,000.00
Soldiers' Homes (including State Homes)	5,703,044.00
Deficiency, Soldiers' Homes	6,300.00
Back pay and bounty	200,000.00
Deficiency, back pay and bounty	300,000.00
Arrears of pay, etc., war with Spain	200,000.00
National cemeteries	413,610.00
Interest on public debt, estimated	25,000,000.00

Total 180,678,204.00
Percentage of revenues, 31.

RECAPITULATION.

Appropriations made at the last session of the Fifty-ninth Congress for the fiscal year 1908, and amount expended under permanent annual appropriations on account of preparation for wars. \$204,122,855.57

Appropriations made at the last session of the Fifty-ninth Congress for the fiscal year 1908 on account of wars. 180,678,204.00

Total 384,801,059.57
Percentage of entire revenues, 67½.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Abstract of army estimates, including pensions, 1906-7 (net estimate).

I. Numbers.
Number of men on the home and colonial establishments of the army, exclusive of those serving in India (total) 204,100

II. Ordinary effective services.	
Pay, etc., of the army	£10,220,000
Medical establishment: Pay, etc.	490,000
Militia: Pay, bounty, etc.	819,000
Imperial yeomanry: Pay and allowances	423,000
Volunteer corps: Pay and allowances	1,244,000
Quartermasters, transport, and remounts	2,111,000
Supplies and clothing	4,492,000
Ordnance department establishments and general stores (ordinary services)	745,000
Armaments and engineer stores (ordinary services)	1,386,000
Works and buildings	2,353,000
Establishments for military education	132,000
Miscellaneous effective services	77,000
War office and army accounts department	559,000

Total ordinary effective services 25,051,000

III. Noneffective services.	
Noneffective charges for officers, etc.	£1,694,000
Noneffective charges for men, etc.	1,684,000
Civil superannuation compensation and compassionate allowances	180,000

Total noneffective services 3,558,000

Total ordinary services 28,609,000

IV. Extraordinary services.

Rearmament of horse and field artillery:	
General stores (harness, saddlery, etc.)	£30,000
Guns, carriages, ammunition, etc.	1,157,000
Total extraordinary services	1,187,000

Grand total, ordinary and extraordinary services * 20,796,000

Abstract of army estimates, including pensions, 1907-8 (net estimates).

I. Numbers.

Number of men on the home and colonial establishments of the army, exclusive of those serving in India (total) 190,000

II. Ordinary effective services.

Pay, etc., of the army	£9,835,000
Medical establishment: Pay, etc.	460,000
Militia: Pay, bounty, etc.	810,000
Imperial yeomanry: Pay and allowances	410,000
Volunteer corps: Pay and allowances	1,152,000
Quartermasters, transport, and remounts	1,909,000
Supplies and clothing	4,060,000
Ordnance department establishments and general stores (ordinary services)	698,000
Armaments and engineer stores (ordinary services)	1,195,000
Works and buildings	2,436,000
Establishments for military education	137,000
Miscellaneous effective services	67,000
War office and army accounts department	567,000

Total ordinary effective services 23,676,000

III. Noneffective services.

Noneffective charges for officers, etc.	£1,714,000
Noneffective charges for men, etc.	1,709,000
Civil superannuation compensation and compassionate allowances	173,000

Total noneffective services 3,596,000

Total ordinary services 27,272,000

IV. Extraordinary services.

Rearmament of horse and field artillery:	
General stores (harness, saddlery, etc.)	£12,000
Guns, carriages, ammunition, etc.	476,000

Total extraordinary services 488,000

Grand total, ordinary and extraordinary services * 27,760,000

Abstract of navy estimates, including pensions, 1906-7 (net estimate).

I. Numbers.

Total number of officers, seamen, boys, coast guard, and royal marines 129,000

II. Effective services.

Wages, etc., of officers, seamen, boys, coast guard, and royal marines	£6,810,700
Victualing and clothing for the navy	2,053,200
Medical establishments and services	275,500
Martial law	14,700
Educational services	165,600
Scientific services	65,100
Royal naval reserves	426,600
Shipbuilding, repairs, maintenance, etc.:	
Section I.—Personnel	2,407,600
Section II.—Matériel	2,827,200
Section III.—Contract work	8,588,400
Naval armaments	2,986,000
Works, buildings, and repairs at home and abroad	1,954,500
Miscellaneous effective services	482,200
Admiralty office	351,500

Total effective services 29,408,800

III. Noneffective services.

Half pay, reserved and retired pay	£820,700
Naval and marine pensions, gratuities, and compassionate allowances	1,256,300
Civil pensions and gratuities	383,700

Total noneffective services 2,460,700

Grand total * 31,869,500

Abstract of navy estimates, including pensions, 1907-8 (net estimate).

I. Numbers.

Total number of officers, seamen, boys, coast guard, and royal marines 128,000

II. Effective services.

Wages, etc., of officers, seamen and boys, coast guard, and royal marines	£6,869,700
Victualing and clothing for the navy	1,996,400
Medical establishments and services	268,700
Martial law	14,200
Educational services	172,500
Scientific services	65,100
Royal naval reserves	418,300
Shipbuilding, repairs, maintenance, etc.:	
Section I.—Personnel	2,549,900
Section II.—Matériel	3,035,200
Section III.—Contract work	7,646,000
Naval armaments	2,343,700
Works, buildings, and repairs at home and abroad	2,758,400
Miscellaneous effective services	401,000
Admiralty office	304,600

Total effective services 28,908,700

* Equals \$145,002,234.

* Equals \$155,092,921.75.

* Equals \$135,094,040.

III. Noneffective services.

Half pay, reserved and retired pay	£837,900
Naval and marine pensions, gratuities, and compassionate allowances	1,302,000
Civil pensions and gratuities	370,900
Total noneffective services	2,510,800
Grand total	* 31,419,500

FRANCE.

Abstract of army expenditures, 1906.

Metropolitan troops, 652,534,143 francs	\$125,939,089.60
Colonial troops, 39,239,229 francs	7,573,171.20
Extraordinary expenses, 26,917,510 francs	5,195,079.43
Total	138,707,340.23

Ministry of the navy—General services of the ministry, 1906.

Salary of the minister and personnel of the central administration	Francs.
Officers and agents in service at Paris	2,777,279
Stores of the central administration	733,406
Stores and various expenses of the hydrographic service	253,050
Officers of the navy	383,000
Engineer officers	9,161,753
Equipment of the fleet	1,689,264
Control of the administration of the navy	42,528,844
Military personnel of the artillery	328,438
Technical personnel	1,586,141
Commissariat of the navy	5,776,538
Administrators of maritime entries	1,126,480
Medical and hospital personnel and chaplains of the different creeds	496,568
Administrative services	1,814,149
Personnel and various agents	3,556,841
Clothing, bedding, and material for instruction	2,126,225
Extra pay for mess	3,356,950
Widows:	4,247,450
Salaries	820,000
Purchases, indemnities, and general service	17,922,984
Hospitals:	
Various expenses of workmanship	419,488
Purchases and indemnities	1,910,613
Transports of marines, expenses of journey and of sojourn, expense of mission	3,450,000
General transports of supplies, freighting, and accessory expenses	1,975,000
Salaries of workmen in the magazines of the fleet	310,080
Provisioning of the fleet, purchase for maintenance of the fleet and current service	14,404,740
General service, purchases for maintenance and the current service of floating material for mobilization	1,500,000
Naval construction	126,550,000
Artillery	27,212,980
Torpedoes and electricity, salaries	773,944
Stock of torpedoes	5,917,173
Torpedoes and electricity, tools and general service	300,000
Tools and provisions at base of operations of the fleet	3,400,000
Hydraulic works and storehouses:	
Salaries	669,581
New works and great improvements	2,628,092
Investigation of the Charente	200,000
Extraordinary works on ports of war and bases of operation of the fleet	14,147,942
Hydraulic works and storehouses:	
Maintenance and current service	1,470,891
Tools and general service	207,616
Fuel, light, furniture for the administration	570,000
Books and bindings	497,850
Gratuities, aids, reliefs, and various expenses	1,062,330
Payment of the general officers and assimilation of the reserves	746,357
Fisheries and commercial navigation:	
Personnel	744,239
Stock and different expenses	296,000
Commercial navigation, return of commercial seamen	135,000
Subsidy for navy invalid fund	12,751,941
Secret expenses	100,000
Total for the navy	* 325,037,217

GERMANY.

Statement of expenditures for army, navy, and pensions, 1905-1907.

ARMY EXPENDITURES.

Administration of the imperial army.	1905.	1906.	1907.
	Marks.	Marks.	Marks.
Ministry of war	3,297,000.00	3,485,200.00	3,588,000.00
Military accounts	463,600.00	467,400.00	485,100.00
Commissariat	3,290,000.00	3,891,300.00	4,003,300.00
Chaplains	1,066,600.00	1,246,800.00	1,268,800.00
Martial law	1,966,600.00	2,296,500.00	2,325,800.00
Higher commanding officers	3,542,400.00	3,851,900.00	3,883,900.00
Governors, commandants, etc.	669,100.00	750,800.00	751,300.00
Adjutants and officers in particular places	1,249,900.00	1,427,100.00	1,431,900.00
General staff and surveyors	3,704,400.00	4,228,400.00	4,312,000.00
Engineer corps	1,858,100.00	2,274,200.00	2,338,000.00
Commissary department	132,479,000.00	147,857,200.00	151,274,900.00
Do.	147,760,400.00	151,700,000.00	159,450,300.00
Clothing and equipment of the troops	34,151,900.00	35,297,000.00	37,105,900.00
Garrison administration and service	65,273,500.00	54,217,400.00	56,086,600.00
Military buildings	2,052,500.00	2,110,000.00	2,159,900.00
Medical department	11,228,200.00	11,451,800.00	11,877,300.00
Administration of artillery stores	1,808,900.00	1,816,700.00	1,838,900.00
Recruits and reserves, etc.	3,292,900.00	3,792,700.00	3,989,100.00
Supply of horses	13,664,200.00	13,656,400.00	13,856,600.00

* Equals \$152,902,996.75.

* Equals \$62,732,182.88.

GERMANY—continued.

Statement of expenditures for army, navy, and pensions, 1905-1907—Continued.

ARMY EXPENDITURES—continued.

Administration of the imperial army.	1905.	1906.	1907.
	Marks.	Marks.	Marks.
Administration of remount stations	3,586,400.00	3,700,700.00	3,749,800.00
Travel expenses, change of service, fresh relays, etc.	11,042,700.00	10,597,500.00	11,299,700.00
Military instruction and education	8,494,600.00	8,930,700.00	8,956,800.00
Military prisons	797,200.00	827,600.00	816,000.00
Artillery	45,446,900.00	49,317,900.00	50,329,500.00
Technical institute	1,405,600.00	2,234,400.00	2,292,400.00
Fortresses, engineering matters, etc.	5,919,400.00	7,278,200.00	7,742,400.00
Additional allowances for dwellings	11,629,200.00	11,811,800.00	12,891,500.00
Aid	1,355,800.00	1,374,400.00	1,381,900.00
Contribution to widows' fund	3,269,600.00	3,319,000.00	3,381,000.00
Miscellaneous expenses	2,566,100.00	2,586,600.00	2,760,600.00
Total	528,533,200.00	547,797,600.00	567,580,100.00
Added to this:			
Army administration of Bavaria	66,293,600.00	68,379,700.00	70,653,000.00
Grand total	594,826,800.00	616,177,300.00	638,233,100.00
Imperial military court for Bavaria	557,500.00	570,800.00	573,500.00
Occasional expenditures (Einmalige):			
Imperial army administration	72,294,100.00	87,521,700.00	108,977,100.00
Imperial military court	10,600.00	13,000.00	892,300.00
Extraordinary expenditures administration of the imperial army	30,004,600.00	38,752,600.00	51,603,400.00
Total of all expenditures	697,633,600.00	743,034,400.00	800,279,400.00
United States equivalent	\$166,051,076.80	\$176,842,187.20	\$190,466,497.20

NAVY EXPENDITURES.

Administration of His Majesty's navy.	1905.	1906.	1907.
	Marks.	Marks.	Marks.
Imperial marine office and marine cabinet	1,663,600.00	1,793,200.00	1,898,500.00
Staff of admiral of the navy	237,000.00	332,100.00	309,300.00
Naval observatories	367,300.00	356,400.00	366,500.00
Commissary department	472,400.00	578,900.00	618,000.00
Administration of justice	128,800.00	168,800.00	170,300.00
Spiritual welfare and garrison instruction	108,600.00	135,100.00	139,800.00
Maintenance of the marines	24,049,600.00	27,018,100.00	29,030,700.00
Commissioning men-of-war	26,708,400.00	28,630,500.00	31,197,200.00
Commissariat	1,907,200.00	2,065,300.00	2,176,400.00
Clothing	394,800.00	412,300.00	440,300.00
Garrison administration	1,389,300.00	1,493,200.00	1,662,400.00
Garrison buildings			669,300.00
Service and allowance for dwellings	3,655,800.00	2,268,300.00	2,557,000.00
Sanitation	1,868,300.00	2,111,800.00	2,317,700.00
Traveling, marching, and freight expenses	3,192,700.00	3,446,000.00	3,411,000.00
Education	398,400.00	405,000.00	492,600.00
Repairs of the fleet and docks	26,301,600.00	28,057,100.00	29,578,500.00
Arms and fortifications	9,687,100.00	10,318,600.00	11,193,700.00
Accounts	712,900.00	873,300.00	920,700.00
Coastal surveys	661,000.00	709,300.00	731,000.00
Miscellaneous accounts	1,293,200.00	1,498,900.00	1,561,400.00
Central administration of the possession Kiauchau	97,100.00	102,000.00	103,900.00
Total	105,295,100.00	112,774,200.00	120,846,200.00
Occasional expenditures (Einmalige), administration or the imperial marine, and contribution for defraying administrative expenses in possession Kiauchau	93,871,700.00	101,813,100.00	111,966,900.00
Extraordinary expenditures administration of the royal marine	46,976,100.00	50,815,000.00	57,370,300.00
Grand total	246,142,900.00	265,402,300.00	290,183,400.00
United States equivalent	\$58,682,010.20	\$63,165,747.40	\$69,063,649.20

PENSIONS, 1906.

Administration of the imperial invalid fund	Marks.
Invalid pensions, etc., since the war of 1870-71 for administration of the imperial army	74,130
Invalid pensions, etc., since the war of 1870-71 for administration of the Emperor's navy	36,571,000
	16,618

Sum of expenditures * 36,661,748

In order to meet the expenditures made necessary by the law pensioning and otherwise providing for persons who had served in the army or navy during the war of 1870-71, as well as their surviving families, the sum of 187,000,000 thalers, 561,000,000 marks, or about \$133,000,000, was set aside by law out of the French war indemnity. This fund is called the "imperial invalid fund," or fund for the disabled (Reichsinvalidenfond).

* Equals \$8,725,496.02.

This fund was to be invested in such wise that there should be a return therefrom in the way of interest, and, in order to cut off the possibility of speculation in these moneys the law fixed the nature of such investments. The beneficiaries were specified in the military pension law of June 27, 1871, to which reference has already been made, and which was supplemented by the laws of April 4, 1874; April 21, 1886, and May 22, 1893, transferring to this fund the payment of certain costs hitherto laid on the Imperial treasury. (Howard's "The German Empire," pp. 253, 254.)

Army:	
Effectives, peace-----	600,000
War-----	4,000,000
Navy: Number of officers, enlisted men, etc.-----	48,500

WAR EXPENDITURES.

The financial burdens.—Article 53, clause 3, of the imperial constitution provides that "the expenditure required for the establishment and maintenance of the navy and the institutions connected therewith shall be defrayed out of the Imperial treasury." Article 62, clause 3, provides, in like manner, that the expenses of the army are to [be] paid out of the Imperial treasury, and that such expenditures shall be fixed by law.

So far as the income of the Empire is not sufficient to meet these expenses they are to be met by means of a contribution made by the several States in the ratio of their population.

The expenditures for military purposes are made by the States having their own military administration, and are made in conformity with the items fixed in the budget and with the provisions of the laws and ordinances on the subject.

All such expenditures, being in fact Imperial disbursements, are under the control of the Imperial auditing court, and must be submitted annually by the Imperial chancellor to the Bundesrath and to the Reichstag for their discharge. (Howard's "The German Empire," pp. 390-392.)

JAPAN'S GENERAL BUDGET, INCLUDING ARMY AND NAVY EXPENDITURES.

On pages 358 and 360 of the Japanese Year-Book for 1907 it is stated that the total ordinary and extraordinary and supplementary budgets for the year 1907-8 are 616,440,000 yen, or about \$308,220,000. The ordinary and extraordinary expenditures for the navy department are \$2,481,000 yen, or about \$41,240,500, and for the navy and war departments, 194,097,000 yen, or about \$97,048,500.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the proposed amendment offered by my colleague from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] for the authorization of four battle ships. I shall make this vote, Mr. Chairman, from a sense of duty to my country. I recall here the fact with a great deal of pride and gratification that it was a distinguished Alabamian, a brave and gallant Confederate soldier, who was very instrumental in laying the comprehensive basis for the growth and improvement of our Navy—commensurate with the growth, development, and responsibilities of our country. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the Hon. Hilary A. Herbert, who was Secretary of the Navy in the last Administration of President Cleveland. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is an axiom in all the civil affairs of life that the men who prepare for reasonable contingencies and difficulties in the future that by reason of that precaution they frequently escape many of these responsibilities and difficulties.

I believe that policy applies more strongly and decidedly to nations than it does to individuals. In the earnest and unprecedented struggle that is going on to-day among the great powers of the world, including our own Government, for commercial supremacy, and certainly for the acquisition of trade, I do not think that I yield to any effeminate or unmanly fear when I say that I apprehend, midst the jealousies and rivalries of this great struggle that is going on for supremacy of commerce, that some friction may arise in the future that will lead to a clash of arms. No man on this floor doubts the fact that if that clash of arms comes in the future by reason of any friction that involves our Government that it will be settled on the high seas by the navies that are involved.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that if such a conflict comes and our Government is found to be vacillating, timid, weak, by reason of being unprepared, the patriotic people of this country will hold the Congress to a terrible responsibility for so grave and serious a dereliction of duty. It is useless for me to recall here to-day the great national events that have taken place in this country in the last few years that have altered and changed our relations to the great powers of the world. These great national events, in my judgment, will be classed in the future as one of the great eras of this country. It is idle, too, for us to bemoan the mistakes, errors, and blunders that, as a Government, we have made that have brought about these conditions. To defend and protect the Philippine Islands from the grasp of a foreign power, whether it be Japan, Germany, or any other foreign power, is a part of our national honor and pride. We can not escape it if we would. Our flag is there and we will maintain it. [Applause.] I do not undertake by words or thoughts to criticize any man who is going to vote differently from what I vote on this subject. It is a question, in my humble judgment, of how we look at what the future may bring to our country. I was glad to hear the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG], a member of the Naval Committee, frankly say that this question of battle ships was in no sense or manner a political or party question. That is certainly true. But I do say that the Democratic party has always stood for a navy sufficient to meet the demands and responsibilities of our country. I would be, and am, as mindful of the expenses of our Government as reason requires. I would not favor any useless expenditure of public moneys on any proposition, but it seems to me that we ought not to hesitate to provide such a navy as would make foreign governments respect our rights, and thereby help us maintain peace throughout the world.

I am certainly not an alarmist. I see no specter of war with lowering clouds in our immediate future. I am not ambitious to have our country rank with the great navies of the world, but merely to have it prepared to defend our rights when assailed. I do not share the prevailing public distemper called "hysteria," "mania," or "frenzy," used so freely as an argument against the building of four battle ships instead of stopping on two. Even should this be true, it is only measured by degrees, for the Naval Committee favors two and the naval board, the Secretary of the Navy, the President, and a large number of Representatives on both sides of this Chamber say, instead of stopping at the building of two battle ships, we should, for the sake of safety and reasonable precaution, build four.

Take the Manchuria incident, that occurred but a few days since. In the Portsmouth treaty Russia acknowledged that it had no concessions or claims in Manchuria of such nature as tended to impair the sovereignty of China. Yet our consul, Mr. Fisher, at Harbin protested in an earnest and diplomatic manner against Russia establishing Russian municipalities in the railway zone independent of the sovereignty of China. Our consul had been instructed by our State Department to recognize no sovereignty but that of China in Manchuria. It is undoubtedly true that our Government, in the interest of the "open-door" policy, will resist encroachments on Chinese rights in Manchuria by either Japan or Russia. I do not hesitate to say that no section of this Union is more deeply interested in maintaining this "open-door" policy than the cotton-growing States of the South. Our hope for the expansion and enlargement of our cotton-goods trade—especially the coarser grade of cotton cloth, chiefly made in our Southern mills—depends on the "open-gate" policy, so that we can have a chance to reach China, as well as Japan, with our cotton fabrics. This is a great and important policy. Yet our Government must stand unalterably for the "open door." It is most earnestly the hope of every patriotic citizen that our known policy for peace in all our relations with foreign powers will enable us to maintain the "open-door" policy, but we can not, from a reasonable standpoint, leave all to successful diplomacy. We ought to have such a navy as will fairly represent our Government in its position and relation to the other governments of the world. I do not at all subscribe to assertions made in this debate that the voting for four battle ships is to enter the race with other nations to surpass them in naval armaments. Our battle ships are not built for the purpose of aggression or conquest, but to enable our country to guard, defend, and assert its rights when assailed improperly by a foreign power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, withholding for a moment the objection which I may not make, I would like to know how much of the time that was allowed for this debate has been consumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-five minutes have been consumed.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, one other question. Can the Chair give to the committee an idea of how much time has been requested, according to the memorandum that he has?

The CHAIRMAN. Very much more than the time allowed by the committee for debate.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question, and that is whether or not if five minutes additional are granted the gentleman, it would come out of the two hours and a half fixed by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. It would come out of the two hours and a half, and the time that is now running comes out of the two hours and a half.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall insist on the five-minute rule until we can see that there is distribution of time sufficient to go around.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman objects.

Mr. LASSITER. Mr. Chairman, in the few moments I can obtain I wish to protest against projects which I conceive to involve an undue increase in the Navy. Certainly no one can accuse the present Committee on Naval Affairs as niggardly or lacking in enthusiasm for the brilliant exploitation of the Department which it controls. One might even scrutinize carefully a programme which it might recommend.

But on Monday last I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama delivering an oration which may fix his place as a farseeing strategist and certainly has established his fame as one of the few brilliant orators that adorn this House. But when I realized his extravagant proposals and knew he was a member of the party I revere, Mr. Chairman, I was grieved; I was alarmed.

From the first session of the Federal Congress, when Nathaniel Macon, grandest of North Carolinians, who for nearly forty years stood here in his place advocating a liberal Navy, while he preserved his character as the severest type of Democratic simplicity and economy, to the administration of William C. Whitney, who first gave to the country an effective modern fleet, the Democratic party has fostered the Navy. But the record of Democracy has been for a Navy consistent with our peaceful needs. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I shall vote for one battle ship, more as an experiment in the most modern type than for any apprehension of its necessity.

My objection to these proposals is threefold—economic, as tending to fix the gripping hold of tariff taxes by the constant demand for a bulging Treasury to meet indefensible contracts. Practically all of our present enormous expenditure is affected by tariff taxes on the articles consumed and is poured into the maw of ever more rapacious trusts. Behind the whole programme is the shadow of trusts—those "infant industries," which, like the Arcadian babes of Juvenal, grasp the pendulous breasts of redundant mothers and drink, not suck.

Another economic objection, subordinate only because it is a condition and not a principle, lies in the misapplication of funds to military objects at a time when our own favored isolation and the condition of the civilized world render transoceanic wars a remote contingency. Had we money to spare, Mr. Chairman, I submit we might better look to domestic objects—the development of our waterways and the impassable condition of the common post-roads of the country. A deafening appeal comes up to us every year from our constituents demanding these immediate necessities of convenient living. Such public works have been the primary care of all nations, reducing the transportation tax on the necessities of life, giving employment to thousands of native labor, both skilled and unskilled, and like the great highways of Rome, France, and England, erecting imperishable monuments to the civilizations which constructed them.

We Americans are an emotional people after all. Naval warfare and naval pomp have in themselves for us something peculiarly heady. Since the conclusion of that lamentable Spanish imbroglio we have had several instances, beginning, perhaps, with that frenzied reception in New York Harbor, of our gentlemanly old admiral. He had returned from an achievement which, apart from its unlucky civil sequelæ, represented little more than exceedingly bad gun practice.

When the ashes of the great Napoleon were transferred from St. Helena to rest on the brink of the Seine, under the golden dome of the Invalides, surely Gallic enthusiasm, spurred on by the interests of a new monarchy, did not surpass American fervor.

This leads up to my third objection to the creation of these enormous armaments. It rests upon the inevitable aggrandizement of the central power wielded by the President.

It is a fact recognized by all foreign students of our political system, laid down a thousand times by our own highest judiciary, and become the elementary truism of every school boy and orator, that the safety of our Government rests upon the separate and coordinate power of the legislative, judicial, and executive departments. Yet, in the last few years, since militarism and imperialism have run riot, we have had a Chief Magistrate half a demagogue and half a king. We have seen the people caressed and paternalized. We have learned to hear the judiciary denounced and told their duty. More often (with malicious amusement) we have seen the majority party in these Halls driven like a flock of school boys, with loud words. Is it unnatural, Mr. Chairman, that a single man, who can by his sovereign word punish a pilot or a chauffeur for deeds done in the royal presence or send the greatest fleet of history around the globe, while he treats directly with crowned heads—is it unnatural, I say, that a single strong man shall arise at no dis-

tant day with the sublime conviction that led Louis XIV to say "L'Etat, c'est moi!"

There exists already two naval pictures which strike the eye of every beholder. You have seen "Nelson on the Victory," sealing in death his devotion to country. "Napoleon on the Bellerophon" needs no comment to tell the despair of a conqueror, once master of the world.

On the 15th of last December the President of these United States stood covered and alone on the bridge of his yacht, sending to their distant fates sixteen of the mightiest engines of destruction man ever made. Each monster flaunted the standard from top and peak; each manned the rail with frenzied cheers, and sixteen times the deep guns thundered the full tale of his due salute. What were the meditations of the central figure who had willed this embodiment of world-wide crisis? Shall this figure be painted? If so, I fear it needs no superscription to read:

Theodore Roosevelt, committing his devoted country to imperialistic chaos.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I shall have to object unless that right is extended to all who speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Washington that the committee has no power to grant general extension.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know that I will want to extend my remarks, but I will object unless it is extended to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order to ask that this privilege be extended to all who speak on this—

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order. Does the gentleman object? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no request pending before the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the opposition has consumed four out of every five minutes used up to this time, I ask that I may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I shall be obliged to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read a letter which I received yesterday. I especially desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to this letter. It is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 13, 1908.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUMPHREY: The inclosed memoranda explain themselves. You will see that the dock can be completed within three years. It can certainly be so completed if you secure the insertion of the clause permitting us to construct the dry dock by contract or otherwise, as may be necessary.

Let me say again what I said to you and your colleagues from the State of Washington, that it is urgently necessary to authorize these dry docks for Puget Sound and Hawaii and provide for their early completion, and that it is no less necessary to provide for four battle ships. I am unable to understand objection to building these four battle ships by any good American who loves the peace of justice, who loves the honor of his land, and who looks into the future.

Yours, sincerely,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

HON. WILLIAM E. HUMPHREY,
House of Representatives.

That letter is from the man who ought to know more about the necessity for four battle ships than any other. No man doubts his honesty, patriotism, or intelligence. I am proud, as one man, to stand upon the floor of this House and indorse the sentiments contained in that letter in regard to the building of four additional battle ships. I know that the people of this country indorse that sentiment.

For many days we have been told often and loudly by the leader of the minority that he is not filibustering to kill time, but that he is filibustering to compel the majority to enact certain legislation, and especially certain legislation desired by the President. He proclaimed in tones most dramatic that if the majority would furnish him twenty-five votes, the legislation recommended by the President would pass the House. The President has urged this legislation for the four battle ships more earnestly and more insistently, perhaps, than any other. If the leader of the minority is inspired by patriotism and not by politics, if he is filibustering for the good of the country and not for the good of his party, as he claims, if he

really wants to enact the legislation desired by the President, here is his opportunity. If he will now stand by the President, I assure him that the twenty-five votes from this side of the House will be forthcoming, and we will pass the amendment for four battle ships, even if we have to demand the ayes and nays to do it.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] just finished a long argument urging economy as a reason why the authorization of the four battle ships ought not to be permitted. If there is any one argument that does not command my respect nor appeal to my judgment, it is the campaign argument of economy. Every four years from time immemorial it has made its appearance, being used by both parties. There is no argument so often appealed to that has so little of merit and so much of demagoguery. The people of this country are not paupers. They are not beggars. The people of this country do not want this nation run on any niggardly plan. The people of this country are intelligent enough to know that to refuse to appropriate money for proper purposes is the greatest and most inexcusable of extravagances. The people care not how much the appropriations are if the money is properly expended. The people of this country want appropriations made in keeping with the needs and the greatness of the country. The gentlemen who make this argument of economy deceive no one but themselves. Everyone else knows that at the bottom it is inspired by politics.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not want to make that statement, does he? Does the gentleman want that statement to go upon the record?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman desires to correct my statement let him do so. He heard what I said.

Mr. MADDEN. I heard it. Do you believe that we should expend more money than we get?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I do not believe that we should spend more money than we get. Neither do I believe in standing upon the floor of this House and playing the demagogue by talking about economy when every man knows it is done largely for campaign purposes.

As one man from the Pacific coast, I desire to go upon record as saying that I do not believe that we are in any immediate danger of having war with Japan. A war between Japan and the United States would be a crime against humanity, it would be one of the greatest calamities that ever afflicted the world. I hope and I believe that the friendship that has so long existed between these two countries will continue unto the end. But no man can read the future. No man knows what a day may bring forth. And while I do not believe that we shall have war, yet, if it should come, then I want my country to be prepared. I believe that the best guaranty of peace is to be prepared for war. I believe in the doctrine of the "big stick," as advocated by the President, in the way that he stated it and not in the way that he is quoted by the yellow papers, when he made use of the old proverb, that "he that talks softly and carries a big stick will travel far."

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] said that, in case of war, among other things upon which we could rely was our Army. I regret to say that so far as protecting our Pacific possessions is concerned, our Army under present conditions would be entirely useless, and this would be true, however large an army we might have, for however many troops we might possess, we could not get them to Hawaii or the Philippines.

According to a recent report of the War Department, in case of war the Army would require 228 merchant ships of various kinds. If we were to face an emergency to-day, we could not even furnish the 28 vessels, let alone the 228. The Department, in the same report, declares that in case of war, 38 vessels should be ready to carry troops in fifteen days. If every American vessel was in her home port on the day that hostilities were declared and every one of them should be voluntarily offered to the Government, we could not assemble that many on both oceans combined in double that time. We could not do it in fifteen months, let alone fifteen days. We could not furnish that number of vessels upon the Pacific Ocean in time to be of service in any contest with a foreign nation. These vessels could not be purchased from foreign nations, even if international law permitted it, which it does not, because practically every first-class ship on the ocean to-day flying a foreign flag is receiving a subsidy that places it under a contract to its home government that would prevent us from purchasing it.

So far as transports are concerned for our Army and vessels as an auxiliary for our Navy, we are in a worse condition to-day than we were when war was declared with Spain. Then it took us twenty days to get enough vessels to carry 10,000 men to the near-by coast of Cuba. And the vessels we did purchase at enormous prices were unsuitable for the purpose and utterly

unfit to make such a voyage as the one to the Philippines or Hawaii would be. For these antiquated and dilapidated vessels we expended \$13,000,000 in purchasing and refitting, and then the War Department declared that by the use of these transports we exposed our troops to greatest peril. The Department declared in a printed report "that the safe arrival of this expedition was entirely due to chance, and the only thing that justified its starting was its safe arrival."

We are as helpless upon the Pacific Ocean as was Russia at the beginning of her war with Japan. If war should come upon the Pacific, the fate of Russia would be our fate. All the events of the present indicate that our next combat will be upon that ocean. If it should be with Japan and we remain in our present condition, she could put half a million men in the Philippines and a hundred thousand men into Hawaii before we could get 10,000 men ready to embark from any point on the Pacific. Not only has she a magnificent navy, but she has to-day 550 vessels suitable for transports on the Pacific; the United States has not more than 15. Japan can carry 200,000 men at one time. The United States on the Pacific can not carry 15,000. Japan has over 500,000 men engaged in her deep-sea fisheries—the best trained seamen in the world—from which to draw crews for her battle ships. There are not to-day upon all the Pacific Ocean a thousand American sailors, native-born and naturalized. We could not, even in time of peace, taking no account of the enemy, using American ships, as we would be compelled to do in time of war, place 50,000 troops in the Philippines in a year. We must depend entirely upon the Navy in any contest upon the Pacific. Our Army, even if we had one, would be useless.

The only guaranty of peace upon the Pacific in the future is a great navy. This is the one object and purpose of a navy on that ocean.

One of the purposes of a navy, theoretically, I know, is to protect our commerce, our merchant vessels in time of war. When the Atlantic fleet finally joined the Pacific Squadron we witnessed the magnificent spectacle, and gave to the wide world a picture never before approached in the annals of men—we have 19 battle ships, 7 cruisers, and a large number of smaller vessels to protect what? Eight merchant ships, the cost of the 8 being little more than the cost of a single battle ship.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] spoke of the deplorable condition of our merchant marine. I agree with him fully in all that he has said upon that proposition. For five years, upon the floor of this House, upon the stump, and in the newspapers and the magazines of the country I have been doing what I could to call the attention of the country to the shameful condition of our merchant marine and pointing out that the fatal weakness of our Navy was the same as that of Russia—our failure to have merchant vessels that could be used as an auxiliary to support it and from which sailors could be secured to man it. This discreditable condition was emphasized and brought to the attention of the public as never before by the trip of the Atlantic Squadron to the Pacific. Yesterday I spoke briefly upon that subject and called attention to the fact that this great country of ours was unable to move its battle ships from the Atlantic to the Pacific without employing foreign ships to carry the coal; that this fleet was to continue its way around the globe, and that in order to do so, it would still be compelled to employ foreign ships, and that while making this trip it becomes helpless as soon as it leaves the Pacific coast, and if a declaration of war was to be made against us, these foreign ships would immediately abandon our vessels, and then our battle-ship squadron, of which we are so proud, could neither continue on their way nor return home. And, as I said then, I say now, that as this fleet continues its way around the globe it advertises to the world our national weakness and our national disgrace.

I do not, however, agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], that because we have no merchant marine we should stop building a Navy. I believe that we should build up a great navy and at the same time that we should build up a great merchant marine to support it. Russia and the United States are the only nations that ever committed the stupid folly of building the one without at the same time building the other. But it would also be an inexcusable folly for this great country not to build either.

I want to stop here long enough to discuss further the proposition of the foreign ships carrying our coal. When the Government called for bids to carry 133,000 tons of coal to supply the fleet on this long voyage only four American firms were able to respond with American ships. There was no combination among these few American ships, however, as has been charged. Those who make this statement do not give the facts. The bids submitted by these American vessels varied

greatly. One American ship offered a bid of \$8 per ton and was accepted. It was enabled to make this offer because the vessel was to remain on the Pacific coast. Its bid was not 50 per cent higher than the bids of the foreign ships, as has been charged. The lowest bid submitted by any foreign vessel was \$6.15 per ton. The American vessels could not get a return cargo. Herein was the great difficulty. But the British ship could go to British Columbia after it had delivered its coal, where it would be favored by its own country—as it should be—over an American ship. Here the British ship could get a cargo for Australia or the British ports of the Orient, and from these ports another cargo could be obtained for Europe. But the American ship must make the 13,000-mile return voyage in ballast. Even if all American ships offered had been accepted, they were not sufficient in number to furnish only a portion of the coal required. All that were offered could carry only sufficient coal for the use of the fleet at San Francisco. The real reason why American ships did not carry our coal was because there are practically no American ships.

PRESENT CONDITIONS ON THE PACIFIC.

Only eight vessels still fly the American flag on all the great Pacific. Last year the commerce of this greatest ocean amounted to over \$3,000,000,000. This is the fleet that we, the nation having the greatest coast line upon that ocean, have to participate in that mighty carrying trade. The line of the Pacific Mail, consisting of five vessels, runs from San Francisco to the Orient. This line runs in direct competition with a Japanese line of inferior vessels that has just been awarded a subsidy by the Japanese Government of \$506,000 annually in gold. Three vessels run from Seattle to the Orient, and two of these vessels go to the Philippines. These vessels run in direct competition with an inferior Japanese line of three smaller vessels, and this line has just been awarded an annual subsidy of \$327,000 in gold by their government. These vessels from Seattle also run in direct competition with a line of British steamers from Vancouver and Victoria that receive \$300,000 annually of government subsidy. In each of these lines the American vessel costs from 25 to 50 per cent more than the foreign vessel. The American vessel pays higher wages to its officers than does the foreign vessel. If these lines were subsidized, character of ships considered, in proportion to the foreign lines the San Francisco line would receive \$700,000 annually and the Puget Sound lines \$500,000 annually. With these great handicaps it takes no prophet to tell what the fate of the few remaining vessels upon the Pacific will be. Unless the Government comes to their assistance the only element of uncertainty in the problem is the time when they will cease to run. Foreign subsidized ships have already driven every unsubsidized American ship from the Atlantic, and the same powers, working in the same way to the same end, will, within the next two years, drive our flag off of the Pacific unless the Government gives assistance.

NAVAL AUXILIARY.

How can we obtain a naval auxiliary and transports for our Army? To argue that this is necessary would be as absurd as for me to stand here and argue that we should have guns on our battle ships. This could be done in two ways. First, by the Government owning its own vessels; second, by paying private enterprise to provide these vessels. In considering this question, remember this great fact: The years of peace are many, the years of war are few, but in all the years of peace we must be prepared for the few years of war. Consider the first way—ownership by the Government. We know that in all business the Government way is the most costly way. We know that to build a ship by the Government would cost more than if built by private parties. We know that the maintenance and the operation of a ship by the Government would cost vastly more than it would if it was maintained and operated by commercial companies. If we needed any proof of these assertions it is amply furnished by the extravagant and disgraceful record of the few Government transports which we now own. A sufficient number of these old, antiquated vessels, mostly purchased from abroad, to carry 10,000 troops over to Cuba cost this nation \$13,000,000 to purchase and refit. Even then they were unsuited for their purpose and exposed our Army to greatest peril. Since the war every pound of freight they have transported for the Government and every soldier that they have carried for the nation has cost the country at least 25 per cent more than the same service would have cost if done by private lines. They have always been largely used as private yachts by Department officials and their friends. Scandal and extravagance have been and are now interwoven with their operation. So far as the nation is concerned, the best thing that could happen to it in relation to these old transports would be to have them sunk in the sea. If such is the record

of the few we now have, what might be expected if we owned the great number sufficient to meet the requirements of our Army and Navy?

But suppose that the Government could construct these vessels and operate them as economically as private enterprise. What of the cost even then? To meet even our present requirements it would take an investment of \$150,000,000. On this investment the interest would be \$3,000,000 annually, the depreciation \$7,000,000, maintenance at least \$30,000,000; or, in other words, outside of the investment it would cost the Government \$40,000,000 annually. I am convinced from a long study of the question that this estimate is conservative; in fact, I feel certain that the red tape and the poor business methods and the favoritism always practiced by the Government would almost certainly increase this sum. This is the one way. What of the other? To induce private enterprise to undertake to carry this burden for the Government is the plan that every other nation that has ever possessed a navy thought wisest and best, except only the United States and Russia. It is not pleasant in this relation to compare our country with Russia, but my hope is that our country may not, as did Russia, learn her lesson in a most humiliating and irretrievable defeat. A naval auxiliary being for the benefit of the whole country the entire country should bear the burden. Why should the nation not pay for a naval auxiliary out of the National Treasury as well as for the Navy itself? They are both for the one and same purpose—the general good. The Government can get the same service from private enterprise for \$4,000,000 annually that she can get from her own vessels for \$40,000,000 annually. In other words, she can get the same service by subsidizing private lines for one-tenth of what it would cost her to own her own ships. Why is this true? The long period of peace and the short period of war. The certainty of peace; the uncertainty of war. Private enterprise can speculate on these years. The Government can not. Private enterprise will run the vessels in the long time of peace. The Government would demand their use only in the short time of war. Not only can the Government, for these reasons, get the same, and in many respects better, service for one-tenth the money from private enterprise, but during the long period of peace the merchant vessels are doing the commerce of the country, increasing our foreign markets, and carrying the products of the American people into all the markets of the world. We are the only nation of earth that makes pretense of being civilized that does not devote the profits of their foreign mails to aiding their shipping. If we would do this, this profit alone would give us a splendid naval auxiliary. Last year this profit was \$3,600,000, and this sum is rapidly increasing.

PHILIPPINES.

May 1, 1898, marked a new epoch in American history. On that beautiful May morning, away on the farther shores of the Pacific, just as "rosy-fingered dawn" had first tinted the soft tropical sky, a line of battle ships bearing the Stars and Stripes moved slowly among the sunken and concealed engines of destruction and death into the entrance of Manila Bay. Then the roar of red-throated cannons startled the nations of the earth. The map of the world had changed in an hour; the Stars and Stripes had moved forward half way around the circuit of the earth; the Philippines were a part of the great Republic. By the fate of war, by the unseen hand of destiny they came to us, and they brought many new, great, and perplexing problems. There is no probability that you and I will ever see the flag depart from these islands. As they stand there to-day, a rich prize, with our weakness on the Pacific, they are a constant menace to the peace of the nation. It may be that many of our people to-day, if it could be done consistently with national honor, would like to see us part with the Philippines. There are doubtless many that regret that fate ever gave them to us, but no American worthy of his country, no American citizen in whose veins courses one drop of patriotic blood would ever consent that any nation should take them from us by force as long as we had a ship that could carry a gun, a soldier who could fire a musket, or a dollar in the National Treasury. Our flag went there in honor and victory, and 90,000,000 American people stand behind the declaration that it shall never be lowered in retreat or trailed in the dust of dishonor. National peace, national safety, national pride, and national honor all demand that we take immediate steps to protect them from themselves and from the rest of the world. When they have learned sufficient to govern themselves they will have learned sufficient to know the advantage of having us protect them. When they know enough to govern themselves then they will know enough to want to remain a part of the Republic. When they are sufficiently civilized for independence they will no more want it than does Alaska to-day.

The American people will never consent to play the coward's part. We will do our duty. We must and we will prepare to protect the flag wherever it floats.

The only way to protect our possession in the Pacific is by a great navy. The only certainty of peace on the Pacific is to be so prepared for war that no nation will dare unjustly to attack us. The honor, the peace, and the safety of this nation imperatively demand that a mighty battle-ship squadron be kept upon the Pacific as well as upon the Atlantic. Therefore I shall stand by the President and do what I can to assist him in his efforts by voting for the building of four battle ships. It is better to build battle ships than to pay pensions.

FOREIGN SHIP TRUSTS.

I now wish to present another side of this question—our need of a merchant marine—the commercial side.

Four years ago, in a speech upon the floor of this House, I said, "unless all history is at fault, unless human nature is to change, just as soon as the foreigner dominates our trade sufficiently to make it safe for him to do so, that moment combinations will be formed between foreign ships, and our freight rates will be raised." I had no doubt of the truth of that prophecy, but I did not so soon expect its fulfillment.

A trust exists upon the Pacific Ocean. It is called the "Shipowners International Union." It represents more than 1,300,000 tons—practically all the sail tonnage on the Pacific Ocean. It is composed of English, German, and French ships. It is open and frank in its purposes. It makes no attempt to conceal its objects. Its rules and regulations have been printed and can be easily obtained. A year ago I inserted a copy of this agreement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As set forth in the agreement, the principal object of this ship trust is to raise freight rates from American ports. In its declared purpose it has been most successful. It has raised freights on the Pacific more than 400 per cent. It has increased the freight on a ton of wheat from Seattle to Europe from \$1.25 to \$5.62 per ton. Any ship is free to charge such rates as it may think best for carrying freight from Europe to this country, but any vessel that charges less than the minimum price fixed by the trust for carrying freight from an American port is subjected to the heavy fine of 5 shillings per ton on the dead-weight capacity of the vessel.

There is another trust on the Pacific Ocean, on the other side, over at Manila. This is a combination of foreign ships and British merchants. When an American vessel goes into Manila Harbor, immediately freight rates drop 10, 20, or 30 per cent, or to any extent to make it unprofitable for the ship to carry a cargo. No sooner does the American ship, on leaving, disappear below the horizon than freight rates go back to their normal condition. This trust has driven every American vessel from Manila except two, and these are able to go only because they very largely carry Government supplies.

Upon the Atlantic there is a combination of foreign ships preying upon our commerce with South America. There is another preying upon our commerce with Europe. These combinations within the last two years have greatly raised freight rates. This raise has not been justified by conditions and has been accomplished only by combination. Not only has the Hamburg-American Packet Company—the name of the foreign ship trust controlling our carrying trade between here and Europe—raised freight rates, but if we can rely upon complaints recently filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission this combine tells the American merchant when he shall send his goods, how he shall ship them, and what amount he shall send, and if any house dare violate these demands or patronize an independent line that house is discriminated against and crushed and driven out of business. This company last year paid a 10 per cent dividend upon ninety-six millions of capital. This vast tribute was levied upon the commerce of this country. It came from the American people.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRUST.

There is a trust preying upon our commerce with South America. This trust has resorted to all the infamies known to organizations of this kind to strangle and kill our South American trade. It is using the rebate, discriminations, and boycott. This trust raises and lowers rates at will, sometimes changing them daily. It promises rebates to those who patronize it for a year or more, but it demands that the full amount be first paid, and then if the parties patronize another line or in any way violate any of its edicts the rebate is withheld. This trust so controls the situation that it has compelled American ships to actually return to this country in ballast. No matter if American ships would offer to carry freight for nothing, they could not get a cargo. One illustration is given where the combine compelled a large coffee firm to refuse to give a cargo to a vessel outside of the trust, although the freight rate was just one-half

less than the trust offered to carry the cargo for. It compelled this firm to give its business at its own price or be destroyed. This trust is composed of English and German ships. Its management, however, is dictated by the great English firm of Lambert & Holt. This firm manages and runs over a hundred vessels.

All firms pool on freights and all meet and divide the spoils. Every American plow, every bag of coffee, every article carried between this country and South America must pay unjust tribute to this gigantic combine. Through its manipulation the American merchant to-day pays double the freight for the same distance upon the same article upon old and antiquated vessels of from 8 to 10 knots that his European competitor pays on fast and modern ships. The freight rates between this country and Brazil are to-day the highest in the world. One of our consuls in South America was amply justified when he said in one of his reports that the—

inadequacy of the transportation service between this country and South American ports is nothing short of a crime, which must be laid at the doors of Congress. Religiously protecting our interests in every other way, fostering and encouraging our manufacturers, and developing home industries for domestic consumption, it makes no provisions for markets for surplus products, and thus paves the way for future industrial stagnation.

There is not a more rapacious, more open, more cold-blooded trust, either on land or sea, than this one of English and German ships that is feeding and fattening upon American trade at the expense of the American people.

Recently Brazilian merchants, who had long been robbed and plundered by this combine, in an attempt to be free, started a line of slow steamers between this country and Brazil. On the 16th of last month a dispatch came from Europe containing information that this foreign trust had already captured or destroyed the line started by the Brazilian merchants. All competition is again destroyed. A meeting was held on that day by the representatives of the various companies in the combination, and freight rates were agreed upon. There is to be no competition. The rate is satisfactory to all in the combine, and all have entered into the pool, and all will participate in the spoils. It is interesting to note that Herr Ballin, director-general of the Hamburg-American Company, the trust that is fattening upon our commerce between this country and Europe, was chairman of that meeting. This is the same Herr Ballin that, in answer to the suit brought against his company before the Interstate Commerce Commission, charging it with rebating and boycotting, has said that this country has no jurisdiction over the matter and that his combine has a right to prey upon American commerce as it pleases, and in this contention I think he is right. This is the same Herr Ballin that came to this country a short time ago, when shipping legislation was pending before Congress, and gave out an elaborate and carefully prepared interview, advising the American people against doing anything to help American shipping. It is needless to add that this interview was republished in the free-trade, subsidy-opposing, subsidized papers of the country with laudatory comments. This is the same Herr Ballin whose company, when war was declared with Spain, withdrew two of its fastest and best vessels and sold them to Spain to "sink, burn, and destroy" American commerce. This same Herr Ballin sits in a meeting in Europe and fixes the freight rates that the American merchant, the American manufacturer, and the American farmer must pay to send his products to Europe or to South America. We have been told ten thousand times by the Democratic party that the price of wheat and cotton in this country was fixed by the price paid in Liverpool. If this Democratic doctrine be true, then Herr Ballin fixes the price of cotton and wheat in this country. Herr Ballin fixes the freight, but the American people pay the freight. We are presuming far upon the patience and intelligence of the American people when we sit here and, either through cowardice or ignorance, permit these things to continue.

These trusts are preying upon our commerce. They are to-day violating the very principles for which President Roosevelt and the American people have been contending. These foreign trusts are to-day doing the same thing in the same way for the doing of which domestic corporations have been enjoined, dissolved, and fined, and their agents prosecuted, convicted, and sent to prison. These trusts are beyond our laws. We have no way to control them. We have no ships to compete with them, and the tribute we must pay is measured only by their greed.

How these outrages, this octopus preying upon the American people, should vex the virtuous soul of Democracy. But it will not. The sympathetic soul of Democracy should, by these things, be touched to tears. But it will not. These foreign trusts were not mothered by the Dingley tariff. There is no opportunity here to exhaust the vocabulary of denunciation upon the system of protection. Therefore, that ever tender and solicitous

self-appointed guardian of the people—in campaign times—the Democratic party, will possess its soul in patience and defend the plundering by a foreign trust that it would denounce with vehement declamation if done by an American trust. But after the Republican party has placed a law upon our statute books, as it will, that will place our flag once more on the sea and will loosen the grip of these great combines now destroying our commerce, then the Democratic party will declare that they always favored such legislation and that the Republican party stole it from them.

The hypocrisy of the Democratic party is further demonstrated, if any further demonstration was necessary, by their actions in this matter, when they say that they are opposed to trusts, and that they are supporting the President. They will not support the President in his policy for a larger navy. They will not support the President in his policy of building up our merchant marine in order to furnish us a naval auxiliary and in order to free the American people from the tribute levied by these foreign ship trusts. The Democratic party supports the President, and the Democratic party fights trusts with their vocabulary always, but never with their votes.

I shall insert in the RECORD some statements relative to these combinations of foreign ships, our South American trade, and our need of a merchant marine.

RECENT CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.

Benjamin Harrison when President, with all the logic and force of his great intelligence, urged Congress to do something for our merchant marine. President McKinley sent several messages urging immediate action for the same purpose. For years every Republican national convention has promised to do something to build up this great industry, but that promise, I regret to say, has not been kept. Both parties are at fault upon this question. Both parties have been moved more by love of party than by love of country upon this question. I blame the Republican more than I blame the Democratic party. It has had greater opportunities than the Democratic party to pass such legislation. And then I blame the Republican party more, for I think we have a right to expect more from the Republican than we have from the Democratic party. President Roosevelt has urged legislation favorable to our merchant marine more insistently than any other statesman in our history. He sent a special message to Congress urging the passage of the bill last winter. When it failed he declared that it was a real blow to our country, and that it was deeply discreditable to us as a nation that our shipping should be driven from the high seas. President Roosevelt has told me on more than one occasion that he regarded the three most urgent questions before the country, in the order of their importance, as follows:

First. The control of great corporations.

Second. The construction of the Panama Canal.

Third. The rehabilitation of our merchant marine.

In accordance with the recommendation of President Roosevelt, a law was enacted in the Fifty-eighth Congress creating the Merchant Marine Commission. The duty of this Commission was to investigate the conditions of our merchant marine and report to Congress. This Commission consisted of five members of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives. The members from the Senate were appointed by the presiding officer of that body, and the Members of the House by the Speaker.

I had the honor to be one of the members of that Commission. We held meetings in every important seaport in the United States. We accumulated a vast fund of most valuable information. At the last Congress this Commission reported a bill to that body. This bill, slightly modified, passed the Senate. It then came over to the House and after considerable modification was passed by the House and sent to the Senate for its concurrence. The great majority of the Senators were anxious to pass this bill as amended by the House. It had practically the indorsement of every board of trade, every chamber of commerce, every commercial and business organization in the United States. The majority of the Members of Congress in both Houses favored its passage. The people of the country favored it. The President was waiting and anxious to sign it. But when it came back to the Senate it was in the closing days of the session. But few hours remained. Then two Democratic Senators, already defeated for reelection, repudiated by their own people, standing discredited with their own constituents, unaccountable to anyone, on their way to private life and oblivion, by filibustering prevented a vote—that is, they talked the bill to death. What little good, if any, these Senators ever did is interred with their political bones, but the evil they did lives after them. Further paraphrasing Shakespeare's lines—nothing in all the public life of these two Senators so benefited the people as their quitting it.

What followed the failure of the last Congress to do anything for our merchant marine? The great Oceanic Line, running from San Francisco to Australasia, a line paying the highest wages of any in the world, a line that was training American boys in seamanship, with ships that had been so built as to be used as an auxiliary for our Navy, was immediately abandoned, and these great vessels no longer run. These magnificent ships are to-day lying idle in San Francisco Bay, and unless the Government comes to their aid, the American flag has disappeared from them forever. Yet this nation, since these American vessels stopped running, has paid to foreign vessels for carrying the same mail over the same route that these American vessels would have carried it, practically the same amount that was asked as aid to these vessels in the defeated bill, and the service of the foreign ships is in every way inferior to what would have been given by the American ships.

The amount of money that we are now paying to foreign vessels for carrying our mails would not only have kept these three American vessels running, but for that amount this line would have added two more new vessels. The three vessels of the Boston Towboat Company, running from Seattle to the Orient and Philippines, as soon as they were satisfied that the bill would be defeated, gave up the unequal struggle and yielded the field to their foreign competitors. The fleet of American ships on the Pacific has been reduced within the past year from fifteen to eight vessels. Only two vessels now go regularly to the Philippines, and these are to be sold as soon as a purchaser can be found. The Government has given notice that it must send its mails for South America twice across the Atlantic in foreign vessels. We have been humiliated by being compelled to employ foreign ships to carry coal for our Navy. We have been discredited in the eyes of the world by being forced to employ foreign vessels to carry our soldiers to Cuba. We have been reduced to the pitiful condition where we can only communicate by foreign ships with our naval stations and our garrison in Samoa. Surely, no American citizen can contemplate these conditions to-day without a feeling of shame, humiliation, and regret, without feeling, as did President Roosevelt, that the defeat of the subsidy bill last winter was discreditable to us as a nation.

I have given you only a few of the evils that followed immediately the defeat of that bill. There is now pending before Congress another bill. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator GALLINGER and in the House by myself. It consists of only a few lines, but it means much to our merchant marine, and it means much to our country. This bill is an amendment to the subsidy act of 1891, a law that has been in successful operation in this country for many years, a law that is directly responsible for every American vessel upon the Atlantic Ocean now flying the American flag. Many of the men who have been denouncing the subsidy system do not even know that this nation has been practicing that system with remarkable success, without protest or objection, for more than fifteen years. In the bill referred to it provides that the Postmaster-General may pay second-class American vessels—that is, vessels of 16 knots or more—for carrying the mails the same rate now paid to first-class vessels. Understand that the classification has nothing whatever to do with the character of the vessel except as to its speed.

The second-class vessel in all other particulars is required to be equal to that of the first-class vessel. This bill means that the Postmaster-General shall pay to second-class vessels \$4 per mile for outward voyages of 4,000 miles or more for carrying the mails. This \$4 is to be paid under the same terms and conditions as are now imposed upon first-class vessels—that is, all vessels must be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Navy, and they must carry American boys and train them in seamanship. They must be ready to answer the call of the Government at any time in case of war, to be used as naval auxiliaries. This bill proposes to pay American vessels a subsidy, a little less than that paid by other nations to their vessels. It simply means that our nation will assist our merchant marine in the same way that every foreign nation assists its merchant marine. If the bill now pending should become a law, it will mean on the Atlantic Ocean four great lines of new, modern, up-to-date ships of six vessels each, running from this country to South America. It means the death of the foreign shipping combination now on the Atlantic that is preying on our commerce between here and South America. It means that our mail will be in South American ports as quickly as it now reaches Europe on its way to South America. It means that the producers of this country can send their products directly to South America in fast, regular ships that will not in every way discriminate against them. What does this bill mean on the Pacific? It will give one line of four vessels from this country to South America, one line from San Francisco to Australasia, two lines from the Pacific coast—one from Seattle and

one from San Francisco—to the Orient and the Philippines. All these lines would have to have six vessels each, and all these vessels would be new except possibly four. This would mean that we could send our mails to our own possessions in our own vessels. It would mean that we will no longer be under the disgraceful necessity of sending our mails, our diplomatic correspondence, our ammunition, and even our soldiers to our own possessions under a foreign flag. It means that we will, to a large extent, retain the great and rapidly developing trade of the Orient. It will prevent the complete disappearance of our flag on the Pacific. The passage of the pending bill would mean adding forty new, great, modern vessels to our merchant marine. It would mean that forty new, great American vessels would be constructed in our yards.

These vessels would cost \$80,000,000 and all would have to carry American boys and all would be at the call of the Government in time of war. It will mean forty new American vessels that will be a glory to the sea and an honor to the nation. It will cause the Stars and Stripes to be carried in many places where it has long since been forgotten. It will add 350,000 tons to our foreign shipping. It will give employment to 200,000 American workmen. It will keep at home a quarter of a million dollars each day now sent to Europe. It will give a million dollars in work and a million dollars in wages each day to American labor that is now given to the foreigner. It will widen our markets. It will increase our exports. It will reduce our freights. It will increase the price of what we sell. It will decrease the price of what we buy. It will build up our shipyards. It will increase the demand for labor. It will increase the wages of those who work. It will benefit all sections, all classes, and all trades. It will give us an auxiliary for our Navy. It will give us transports for our Army. It will give us crews for our battle ships. It will make us independent of every other nation. It will make our flag more revered at home and more respected abroad. It will protect us in war and add to our wealth in peace. It will make the great Republic truly a world power, the mightiest nation in all the history of the world. And what will all this cost? One-half the price of a first-class modern battle ship each year perhaps, not more; \$4,000,000 annually perhaps, not more. The profits on our foreign mails perhaps, not more. Is it worth the price?

I am proud to say that upon this question in the Senate patriotism triumphed over politics, love of country over regard for party; and this bill passed that body a few days ago without a dissenting vote. This action in the same body, where a year ago it was talked to death, shows the growth of public sentiment on the question.

I desire to quote two recent statements upon the proposition of mail lines, indorsing the pending bill, made by two men whose utterances, I believe, will have as much weight and carry as much conviction with the people as any two men in America. The first is from the message of President Roosevelt on December 3, 1907. He said:

I call your especial attention to the unsatisfactory condition of our foreign mail service, which, because of the lack of American steamship lines, is now largely done through foreign lines, and which, particularly so far as South and Central America are concerned, is done in a manner which constitutes a serious barrier to the extension of our commerce.

The time has come, in my judgment, to set to work seriously to make our ocean mail service correspond more closely with our recent commercial and political development. A beginning was made by the ocean mail act of March 3, 1891, but even at that time the act was known to be inadequate in various particulars. Since that time events have moved rapidly in our history. We have acquired Hawaii, the Philippines, and lesser islands in the Pacific. We are steadily prosecuting the great work of uniting at the Isthmus the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific. To a greater extent than seemed probable even a dozen years ago, we may look to an American future on the sea worthy of the traditions of our past. As the first step in that direction, and the step most feasible at the present time, I recommend the extension of the ocean mail act of 1891. That act has stood for some years free from successful criticism of its principle and purpose. It was based on theories of the obligations of a great maritime nation, undisputed in our own land and followed by other nations since the beginning of steam navigation. Briefly those theories are, that it is the duty of a first-class power, so far as practicable, to carry its ocean mails under its own flag; that the fast ocean steamships and their crews required for such mail service are valuable auxiliaries to the sea power of a nation. Furthermore, the construction of such steamships insures the maintenance in an efficient condition of the shipyards in which our battle ships must be built.

The expenditure of public money for the performance of such necessary functions of government is certainly warranted, nor is it necessary to dwell upon the incidental benefits to our foreign commerce, to the shipbuilding industry, and to ship owning and navigation which will accompany the discharge of these urgent public duties, though they, too, should have weight.

The only serious question is whether at this time we can afford to improve our ocean mail service as it should be improved. All doubt on this subject is removed by the reports of the Post-Office Department. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1907, that Department estimates that the postage collected on the articles exchanged with foreign countries other than Canada and Mexico amounted to \$6,579,043.48, or \$3,637,226.81 more than the net cost of the service exclusive of the cost of transporting the articles between the United States exchange post-offices and the United States post-offices at which they were mailed or delivered. In other words, the Government of the United States,

having assumed a monopoly of carrying the mails for the people, is making a profit of over \$3,600,000 by rendering a cheap and inefficient service. That profit, I believe, should be devoted to strengthening our maritime power in those directions where it will best promote our prestige. The country is familiar with the facts of our maritime impotence in the harbors of the great and friendly Republics of South America. Following the failure of the shipbuilding bill, we lost our only American line of steamers to Australasia, and that loss on the Pacific has become a serious embarrassment to the people of Hawaii and has wholly cut off the Samoan Islands from regular communication with the Pacific coast. Puget Sound in the year has lost over half (four out of seven) of its American steamers trading with the Orient.

We now pay under the act of 1891 \$4 a statute mile outward to 20-knot American mail steamships, built according to naval plans, available as cruisers, and manned by Americans. Steamships of that speed are confined exclusively to trans-Atlantic trade with New York. To steamships of 16 knots or over only \$2 a mile can be paid, and it is steamships of this speed and type which are needed to meet the requirements of mail service to South America, Asia (including the Philippines), and Australia. I strongly recommend, therefore, a simple amendment to the ocean mail act of 1891 which shall authorize the Postmaster-General, in his discretion, to enter into contracts for the transportation of mails to the Republics of South America, to Asia, the Philippines, and Australia at a rate not to exceed \$4 a mile for steamships of 16 knots speed or upward, subject to the restrictions and obligations of the act of 1891. The profit of \$3,600,000 which has been mentioned will fully cover the maximum annual expenditure involved in this recommendation, and it is believed will in time establish the lines so urgently needed. The proposition involves no new principle, but permits the efficient discharge of public functions now inadequately performed or not performed at all.

The other is from an address before Chamber of Commerce, at Trenton, N. J., March 23, 1908, by Secretary William H. Taft. He said:

With our immense coast line on the Pacific, with the deep interest that we have in the Chinese trade, certainly we ought to take steps to assist the reconstruction and maintenance of steamers carrying the American flag from our west coast to the Orient. The bill which offers inducements for the construction of ships to earn the mail subsidies proposed will be an experiment in this direction, and if it proves to be successful it ought to be followed by greater and greater Government contributions to the building up of our merchant marine. I can not understand any difference in principle between Government assistance to our merchant marine and our protective-tariff system, our system of improvement of internal waterways, or any other method by which the general welfare is promoted through the Government's assistance of particular industries, in which all may engage. Let us hope that the mail-subsidy bill will lead to the establishment of direct lines between New York and South America, on the one hand, and between the Pacific coast, Japan, China, and the Philippines, on the other, and that it may be the means of pointing out how a wider system of maintenance of the marine may be inaugurated in the public interest.

We are expending from \$200,000,000 to \$250,000,000 to build a canal across the Isthmus of Panama. Can it be that this canal is to be built solely for vessels of other countries than the United States? Is it true that the flag of the United States will fly over but few merchantmen passing through this great conquest of nature? The work of the canal is going on. The dirt is flying at the rate now upward of two and one-half million cubic yards a month. We have every hope that six years from next July our battle fleet may be able to ascend through the locks to the new-made lake and to descend on the other side through the locks to the sea. Ought we not in the six years which lie between the present and the completion of the canal adopt a policy which shall give us a merchant marine to justify our expending this enormous sum of money on commercial as well as naval and war strategic grounds?

If you wish to go to South America to-day, you must go in a foreign ship. You must twice cross the Atlantic. You must go to New York and from New York to Liverpool, and then from Liverpool across the Atlantic again to the South American port. When you send a letter to South America it also goes the same route, crossing the Atlantic twice in a foreign ship. An American merchant sending his wares requiring prompt delivery to South America must ship them to Europe and from Europe back to the South American market, and this must be done in a foreign ship, the ship of his rival and competitor. Do you wonder that with such a terrible handicap as this our trade with South America is constantly decreasing and has about disappeared? The supplies for our little army in the Philippines must soon all go under another flag. On the 2d day of this month 500 rifles and 20,000 rounds of cartridges were sent to these islands in a Japanese ship. We can communicate with Samoa only by foreign ships, where we have a naval station and a garrison. The Government was compelled to hire foreign vessels to carry the coal used by the American Navy on its trip from the Atlantic to the Pacific. A few weeks ago we employed foreign ships to carry our soldiers to Cuba. No American vessels were to be had. There is no second-class power of the world but what would consider these things a national disgrace. We are spending millions to improve our harbors to accommodate foreign ships. We are spending millions to build the Isthmian Canal, and when it is finished it will be traversed almost entirely by the ships of other nations. We are contributing to the naval strength of other nations, helping to build foreign navies, helping to train foreign seamen that in time of war may be used against us. Our trade is at the mercy of foreign combines and trusts that discriminate against us.

THE PRESIDENT.

In the White House to-day sits one of the greatest men of the modern world. The people of this country believe in Theo-

dore Roosevelt, and they believe in his policies. They are with him in his great fight against millionaire criminals. They are with him in his policy that there shall be no preferred class before the law in this country; that the law shall be enforced alike against great and small, rich and poor. They believe with him that he who steals a million is as much a thief as he who steals a loaf of bread. And the people of this country to-day are behind President Roosevelt in his policy to build a great navy and a great merchant marine.

THE PEOPLE NOT SATISFIED WITH CONDITIONS ON THE SEA.

Are the people of this nation satisfied with the conditions to-day upon the sea? I do not believe it. I do not believe that the people of this great country are satisfied that our matchless commerce, the mightiest that the world has ever known, shall be carried under a foreign flag. I do not believe that they are satisfied that we shall pay half a million dollars each day to foreign labor for work that should be done by American labor; that \$750,000,000 should be invested in foreign shipyards building ships to carry our commerce; that 500,000 foreigners should be given work and wages in building and operating these ships. I do not believe that they are satisfied that \$200,000,000 each year should be taken out of this country, sent abroad, given to foreigners to carry our own products to our own markets. I do not believe that the American people are satisfied that we should continue to spend millions to construct naval vessels that, when completed, we can not furnish with crews; that our Army shall remain without transports, our Navy without an auxiliary, and the nation continue to be powerless to protect our possessions over which our flag floats. I do not believe that the American people are satisfied that even our mails, our ammunition, and our soldiers should be carried to our own possessions under another flag. I do not believe that the American people are satisfied that we should spend countless millions in constructing the Panama Canal mostly for the benefit of other nations; that we should spend \$40,000,000 annually to improve our rivers and harbors for the benefit of foreign ships.

I do not believe that the American people are willing that the prosperity and the safety of this country should be given into the power and keeping of the other nations of the world. I do not believe that the American people are willing that our flag shall permanently disappear from the sea. I believe that the American people will demand that Congress should do its duty and that demand will soon come with such force that cowardice, selfishness, and political expediency can not long stand before it. The people of this country will never be content until Congress has written upon the statute books a law that will make us supreme upon the ocean as we are to-day supreme upon the land; a law that will cause a just part of our matchless commerce to be carried in American ships, built in American yards by American labor, paid American wages, manned by American seamen, and flying the American flag. The American people will never be content until a law has been placed upon our statute books that will restore the ancient prestige, the greatness, and the glory of our merchant marine; a law that will again cause our ships to travel all the highways of the ocean, our sails to whiten every sea, and our flag to shadow all the ports of the world. Yes; I believe, I know, that the great, patriotic people of this mighty Republic will never be content until the Stars and Stripes, "your flag and my flag," shall again proudly fly on all the circuit of the seas.

Your flag and my flag, and how it flies to-day;
In your land and my land and half the world away;
Rose red and blood red its stripes forever gleam,
Snow white and soul white, the good forefathers' dream;
Sky blue and true blue, with stars that gleam aright;
The gloried guidon of the day; a shelter thro' the night.
Your flag and my flag, and oh, how much it holds!
Your land and my land secure within its folds;
Your heart and my heart beat quicker at the sight;
Sun-kissed and wind-tossed, the red and blue and white;
The one flag, the great flag, the flag for me and you;
Glorified all else beside, the red and white and blue.

APPENDIX.

A prominent American who recently had occasion to go to Valparaiso on important business, in a letter thus describes the poor service furnished by foreign vessels to South America:

"The first steamer sailed from New York on September 7, and I reached Colon on September 16. The first steamer leaving Panama sailed on the 21st. You may understand the annoyance to which I was subject when I state that I was from September 21 until October 17, twenty-seven days, in going to Valparaiso, a distance in round numbers of 3,000 miles. I was forty-one days from New York to Valparaiso. The accommodations are wretchedly inferior for passenger and mail service on the Pacific coast between Panama and Valparaiso. There are two steamship companies that control the traffic, the South American Steamship Company, Chilean, and the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, British. The companies have formed a combination and they offer the poorest kind of service. In 1889 when I first came to this coast the trip from Panama to Callao was made regularly in

nine days, and now it takes from fourteen to sixteen. Many of the same steamers are still in commission, and naturally they are old, dirty, and inconvenient, besides overburdened with traffic. Freight and passenger business on the line has doubled. I am told, in the last five years, and rates have also increased. It now costs \$210 American money for a ticket from Panama to Valparaiso, whereas the price fifteen years ago was \$150. Both companies have so much trade that they can not handle it and seem to be incapable of improving the service. Both are getting enormous profits, and yet do not offer to the public as good accommodations as they did fifteen years ago. When I went to the United States last May I took an English ship, the *Oronosa*, that went south to the Straits of Magellan, through the Straits to the Atlantic and thence to Liverpool. Afterwards I sailed from Southampton for New York, and I made the entire trip, a distance of 13,000 miles, in exactly forty-one days. By a strange coincidence, it took me exactly forty-one days to come from New York to Valparaiso, a distance of 5,000 miles. The route via Europe was in clean, up-to-date steamers that wasted no time. The west coast trip was in very inferior steamers that made more than twenty stops, sometimes for three days at a time, for the purpose of picking up cargo. I can not too strongly urge the necessity of some movement that will result in better steamship facilities on the coast. Improvement in American trade in these countries is practically impossible under present circumstances. If a good line of American steamers can be put on this route, it will revolutionize conditions and bear rich fruit for American interests. I am informed the Hamburg-American Line is preparing to establish a new line of steamers on this coast. If it does, it will improve matters, but will help German trade more than that of the United States."

THE EUROPEAN STEAMSHIP TRUST IN OUR TRADE WITH SOUTH AMERICA.

Secretary Root said, on his return from his journey around South America, in an address before the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress at Kansas City, November 20, 1906:

"Between all the principal South American ports and England, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, lines of swift and commodious steamers ply regularly. There are five subsidized first-class mail and passenger lines between Buenos Ayres and Europe; there is no such line between Buenos Ayres and the United States. Within the past two years the German, the English, and the Italian lines have been replacing their old steamers with new and swifter steamers of modern construction, accommodation, and capacity.

"In the year ending June 30, 1905, there entered the port of Rio de Janeiro steamers and sailing vessels flying the flag of Austria-Hungary 120, of Norway 142, of Italy 165, of Argentina 264, of France 349, of Germany 657, of Great Britain 1,785, of the United States no steamers and 7 sailing vessels, 2 of which were in distress.

"An English firm runs a small steamer monthly between New York and Rio de Janeiro; the Panama Railroad Company runs steamers between New York and the Isthmus of Panama; the Brazilians are starting for themselves a line between Rio and New York; there are two or three foreign concerns running slow cargo boats, and there are some foreign tramp steamers. That is the sum total of American communications with South America beyond the Caribbean Sea. Not one American steamship runs to any South American port beyond the Caribbean. During the past summer I entered the ports of Para, Pernambuco, Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, Santos, Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, Bahia Blanca, Punta Arenas, Lota, Valparaiso, Coquimbo, Tocopilla, Callao, and Cartagena—all of the great ports and a large proportion of the secondary ports of the Southern Continent. I saw only one ship, besides the cruiser that carried me, flying the American flag. The mails between South America and Europe are swift, regular, and certain; between South America and the United States they are slow, irregular, and uncertain. Six weeks is not an uncommon time for a letter to take between Buenos Ayres or Valparaiso and New York. The merchant who wishes to order American goods can not know when his order will be received or when it will be filled. The freight charges between the South American cities and American cities are generally and substantially higher than between the same cities and Europe. At many points the deliveries of freight are uncertain and its condition upon arrival doubtful. The passenger accommodations are such as to make a journey to the United States a trial to be endured and a journey to Europe a pleasure to be enjoyed. The best way to travel between the United States and both the southwest coast and the east coast of South America is to go by way of Europe, crossing the Atlantic twice. It is impossible that trade should prosper or intercourse increase or mutual knowledge grow to any great degree under such circumstances. The communication is worse now than it was twenty-five years ago. So long as it is left in the hands of our foreign competitors in business, we can not reasonably look for any improvement. It is only reasonable to expect that European steamship lines shall be so managed as to promote European trade in South America rather than to promote the trade of the United States in South America."

These foreign steamships to Brazil and Argentina are and long have been in a hard and fast trust or combination. Consul-General Seeger, at Rio de Janeiro, spoke thus of this foreign trust in a report in 1903:

"The united steamship companies which control the carrying trade between the United States and Brazil—the Lamport & Holt Line, the Prince Line, the Robert M. Sloman Line, and the Chargeurs Reunis—have agreed to raise their rates on coffee from Santos and Rio de Janeiro from 30 cents and 5 per cent prime per bag of 133 pounds to 35 cents and 5 per cent. This rate will go into force in October."

In an earlier report the consul-general had said:

"Since last August the freights have been raised and lowered and lowered and raised again to suit the purpose of the trust till they have reached their present level. The trust has an agreement with coffee shippers here to pay them a rebate of 5 per cent at the end of every six months from the date of the agreement on all freights collected; provided, however, that this rebate is forfeited in case the shippers give freight to any vessel not belonging to the trust during the period stipulated. Through this arrangement the trust controls the shippers and American vessels go home in ballast."

A writer and traveler, Julian Haugwitz, in *American Trade*, has said of the "combine":

"THE BRAZILIAN SHIPPING RING."

"Our commerce with Brazil and the River Plata countries is at the mercy of such a shipping combine. Ostensibly four lines are competing in 'serving' the route between New York and Pernambuco southward, viz, the Lamport & Holt Line, Prince Line, Norton Line, all British, and the R. M. Sloman Line, which is German. In reality, however, the management of these services is centralized in Liverpool, the freights are pooled, and the spoils divided pro rata.

"At the head of this syndicate stands Lamport & Holt, of Liverpool, a powerful firm owning and managing over a hundred vessels. The ships engaged in the New York-South American service are mostly slow

and obsolete, steaming 8 to 10 knots an hour, and yet the rates of freight levied on American cargo are nearly double those charged by the speedy, modern, elegant ships plying between Europe and the east coast of South America. Not a case of kerosene or a bag of coffee can escape paying toll to this freight ring, and there was more truth than comedy in the facetious request sent by a Rio shipper to the syndicate's agents at that port asking for a permit to ship some coffee on an outside vessel over their ocean. Numerous tramps or outsiders have been willing in Brazilian ports to take coffee to New York for 20 cents a bag, instead of 40 cents, as now exacted. But whenever such a vessel has been placed on the berth the syndicate has promptly lowered its freight to 10 cents, besides boycotting the shippers patronizing the intruder.

"A POLICY OF EXCLUSION."

"Another way by which the syndicate tightens its grip on its victims is to offer them a graduated return on the freights paid at the end of the year, provided no case of infidelity has occurred. An example illustrative of the combine's methods of persuasion and the shippers' liberty of trade happened last fall, when a large coffee firm in Santos received an order for 20,000 bags of coffee from New York. The syndicate's freight charge was 40 cents a bag, plus 5 per cent, but several outsiders were anxious to carry this cargo at 20 cents, which meant a saving of \$4,000 to the exporter on this lot alone, and in the same proportion an economy of \$1,000,000 to American coffee drinkers on the 5,000,000 bags imported from Brazil last crop year. The firm in question, having the freight room on hand at 20 cents, asked the syndicate to take the coffee at the same rate, and on the latter's refusal advanced its offer to 30 cents. The combine insisted on its full pound of flesh, and when the exporter accepted the tramp's charter, the former dropped its rates to 15 cents and later to 10 cents for all other shippers, debarring this firm and one or two other strikers from shipping on the combined boats except at the full old rates.

"The enormous advantages enjoyed by their less independent competitors, thanks to the combine's bounty, and worth thousands of dollars a day in a business worked on close margins and daily cable offers, soon brought the insurgents to terms, capitulation followed and the former rates were restored. One over-conscientious agent at Santos demurred to boycotting his neighbor, and his scruples cost him the loss of the Sloman Line agency."

A New York merchant in the Brazil trade wrote on August 19, 1905, in the New York Journal of Commerce:

"I beg leave to call your attention to the very important fact, evidently overlooked by Special Agent Hutchinson and Consul Furniss, that merchants dealing with Brazil have valid and just causes for complaint, owing to the fact that all the steam transportation companies carrying freight between United States ports and Brazil formed a combination some years ago, and as they monopolize the trade, their rates of freight are so high as to be prejudicial to the business interests of those who are unfortunately obliged to patronize these companies.

"Any independent merchant in this city (New York) or in Brazil—whether importer or exporter—knows that the Lamport & Holt, Prince and Sloman lines, plying between this and Brazilian ports, from Pernambuco southward, exact exorbitantly high rates of freight on merchandise carried either way. In the coffee trade it is a well-known fact that these monopolists, notably Lamport & Holt, discriminate in favor of some of the large importers of coffee by making them substantial concessions in freight, which, of course, is detrimental to the smaller importers. This disgraceful state of affairs certainly calls for a drastic remedy. As a merchant and shipper long connected with Brazil, I most heartily and unqualifiedly indorse Consul Furniss's recommendation concerning the need for an American steamship line between the United States and Brazil. Practically the entire trade between the United States and Amazon ports and Maranhão and Ceará is monopolized by the Booth Steamship Company, of Liverpool, which, owing to arrangements concluded with other steamship companies, dictates rates, conditions, etc., to suit itself, but always at the expense of the interests of this country. I hope the consul's appeal will result in the establishment of a new line of steamers, which I am positive would speedily secure a very large share of the business between this country and Brazil."

Consul Furniss at Bahia, alluded to above, said in his annual report for 1904:

"I have to reiterate my oft-repeated report of the need of an American steamship line. The mail service between the United States and this section of Brazil during the year just past has become much worse than heretofore, due to the withdrawal of one or two monthly boats. As a result of the cargo offering here for the United States and the frequent call of vessels to get it, coupled with the fact that Brazil requires all steamers to take mail, there have been frequent calls of vessels to get mails from here, but there is only one regular boat bringing mails from New York. Between times, letters are sent either from New York by various roundabout ways. This has virtually paralyzed the mail service. For this reason it is frequently the case that mail sent from New York in the middle of a month arrives here days after the mail leaving New York on the first of the ensuing month. This causes great prejudice to business, as the mails arriving last often have bills of lading and custom-house documents for goods arriving by the prior steamer, necessitating extra expense, vexatious delays, and great trouble to withdraw from the custom-house here, which seriously hurts our trade.

"It is impossible to maintain trade without frequent and rapid mail service. With the lack of this to contend with and the high freight charges out of New York, it is not to be wondered at that year by year our trade with this section is growing less, while the balance of trade in favor of Brazil is increasing. The present lines from New York seem to prefer high freight and little business, and make up by sending their vessels on a triangular course, viz, from Brazil to the United States, from the United States to Europe, and then from Europe, with European goods, to Brazil, with only a few vessels going and coming between Brazil and the United States direct. The German steamship lines are making preparations for an increased service with Brazil. With the aid given by these lines German trade has increased even more rapidly than ours is decreasing, and with the contemplated further increase in its fleet the outlook for German trade is even brighter than heretofore.

"The manner in which the trade interests of the United States are made to suffer by reason of the inadequacy of the transportation service between this country and South American ports is nothing short of a crime which must be laid at the doors of Congress. Religiously protecting our interests in every other way, fostering and encouraging our manufacturers, and developing home industries for domestic consumption, it makes no provision for markets for surplus products, and thus paves the way for future industrial stagnation. In the meantime other

countries reap the benefits of the trade demands of these nations by establishing steamship lines and commercial agencies in every important city. Is it any wonder that Mr. Lincoln Hutchinson, who is now in Brazil making a study of the conditions there, exclaims: 'The mass of the people scarcely know that such a country as the United States exists!'

Hon. John Barrett, then minister to Argentina, said in 1904: "I wish to explain a little in regard to this point. The question arises, If the business is there, why do not men go into it? Let me remind you that Europe has become established in this trade in the first place, and that she controls it at the present time. All the steamship lines that undertake this business are European steamship lines, and wishing to build up the trade with Europe rather than with America, they form combinations and use their influence against the establishment of American lines. You see that in the agreement of the Lamport & Holt Line, which runs a line of passengers to Rio, but does not go on to Buenos Ayres. Because of an agreement with the Royal Mail Steamship Company of England, they agree that they will not run their passenger steamers farther than Rio, and yet I was informed in New York and Philadelphia that an American company was already organized that would be willing to undertake to put on a line of steamers between New York and Buenos Ayres, provided they could receive enough money for carrying the mails to insure them against loss while they were establishing a regular trade and traffic."

Consul-General Anderson at Rio de Janeiro, in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of September 29, 1906, said that:

"Merchants complain that the high freight rates obtaining on goods from the United States to Brazil generally continue to act as a deterrent to trade in general. The conference rates (the conference is the European steamship trust) on goods from the United States to this part of South America are nearly twice as high as freight rates from Asiatic ports to the United States."

Consul-General Anderson said, in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of December 10, 1906:

"The steamship *Goyaz*, the ship of the Lloyd Brasileiro, which inaugurated a regular service between Brazil and the United States about the latter part of August, took a cargo of coffee at 20 cents per bag, as compared with the price of 35 cents charged by the conference ships, the latter of course being subject to the rebate agreed upon, which is made at the end of the year and is proportionate to the amount of coffee shipped. In addition to this cut in the market made by the Brazilian line, one of the largest shippers of coffee in Rio chartered a ship and furnished her total cargo the past week, making quite a cut in the cargoes expected for several conference ships. The result of the opposition to the ship combine is uncertain, but it seems to be generally agreed that the conference rate is too high.

"Freights between the United States and Brazil are much higher than those obtaining in the rest of the world, the rate from New York to Rio de Janeiro being about twice what the rate is from Hongkong to New York. American exporters are vitally interested in this matter, for even assuming that the rates from Europe to Brazil and from the United States to Brazil are practically the same—a fact which is not yet established—it is yet to be noted that the high freight rates shut American exporters out of markets which otherwise they might have. Low freight rates, for instance, would enable American millers to ship American flour to ports in Brazil far south of their present limit. Freight rates from New York to Brazil similar to those obtaining between New York and the Far East would mean largely increased sales of American flour. What is true of flour is true of other things. The rebate system adopted by the shipping combine also works directly and materially against small shippers, among the latter being most American exporters selling to the Brazilian trade."

This competition of the new Brazilian Lloyd Line, in small, slow steamers, seems to have been ineffective to break up the European combination. The Brazilian ships are too slow for the service. Thus the *Goyaz*, bringing passengers, mails, and merchandise, which left Rio de Janeiro February 12, stopping at several way ports, did not reach New York until March 13. A decent mail and freight steamship should make this passage in fifteen days.

The rate war started by the Brazilian ships did not amount to much. A cable dispatch to the New York Herald of February 16 said:

"HAMBURG, Saturday.—The conference held during the last three days in London by representatives of all the German and English steamship companies engaged in the trade between North America and Brazil, during which Herr Ballin, director-general of the Hamburg-American company, acted as chairman, is reported to have resulted in an agreement by which the rate war, which has now lasted more than one year, is terminated. It is added that a community of interests in which all the companies participate has been created."

Herr Ballin, head of the European trust monopolizing the trade between our ports and South America, is also the head of the Hamburg-American Steamship Company, of Hamburg, now being accused before the Interstate Commerce Commission of maintaining a monopoly in "restraint of trade," practicing rebates, discriminations, etc., between the United States and North Europe. Herr Ballin's defense is that the United States has no jurisdiction.

One result of the London meeting of this European ship trust described above is a heavy increase in freight rates on American manufactured and agricultural products shipped from our ports to South America. A New York firm of merchants engaged in the export trade says in a letter of March 4, 1908:

"The Lamport & Holt, Prince, and German lines are in combination. Before the late agreement the rate on cotton-seed oil had been as low as 9 cents a foot to Rio and Santos. It is now 16 cents to Rio de Janeiro and 14 cents to Santos.

"Lard was 19 cents in kegs, 10 cents in cases a foot. Now 30 cents a keg to Rio, 30 cents a keg to Santos, 20 cents a case to Rio, 20 cents a case to Santos.

"Bacon and other special lines were advanced in proportion. General merchandise is now ruling from 24 to 27 cents a foot. There was no very great cut on general merchandise, but before the late settlement figures ruled about 10 per cent less. These rates are net, no primeage. The Lloyd Brasileiro quotes about 10 per cent less and net rates. At present the three lines, the Lamport & Holt, Prince, and the German line, who are in the combination, do not penalize anyone who may ship by the independent lines, but there is no question that they will try to do so as soon as possible, as was done before."

These discriminations of the European ship trust bear with especial severity on our Western and Southern agricultural products. Brazil, a tropical country, ought to be a great and profitable market, but the Brazilian Review recently said:

"Argentine flour has entirely monopolized the South. Rio, and Santos, has driven the American article from Bahia and Victoria, and is already competing vigorously for the markets of Pernambuco."

Our consul-general at Rio de Janeiro reported some time ago: "A Rio commission house made a profit by shipping flour from New York to Europe and thence to Rio, although the increased difference of travel was over 3,000 miles."

On May 6, 1907, the Post-Office Department instructed the postmaster at New York to send the mails for Rio de Janeiro by way of Europe in all cases except once a month, when a foreign steamer of nominally 14 knots was sailing for South America.

In the case of the Cosmopolitan Shipping Company, of Philadelphia, against the "Baltic Steamship Pool," made up of several European steamship companies, the Hamburg-American, of Hamburg, the North German-Lloyd, of Bremen, the Wilson, of Hull, and the Scandinavian, in which this European ship trust was accused of rebates, discriminations, and other policies in "restraint of trade" in our commerce with north Europe, the Interstate Commerce Commission, a few weeks ago, decided that it had no right to interfere, under existing law, as the trust complained of was a foreign concern, and its offenses were beyond our jurisdiction. In other words, a foreign steamship combination, operating on the high seas in our export trade, can discriminate and oppress American producers at its will.

This decision makes more imperative the need of competing and independent American steamship services. As the Merchant Marine Commission said, in the words of Senator GALLINGER:

"It is possible that if there were American steamship companies in our trade with South America they might form a combination of their own. But in that event, as American companies organized in the United States, they could be held responsible by our Government, while it would be very much more difficult to prosecute and break a combination 'in restraint of trade' by foreign companies, which can not so readily be reached by American laws."

Moreover, if there were American steamship companies, their stock or bonds would be owned or controlled in large measure by American merchants and manufacturers and other business men, who would have a great deal of interest in maintaining favorable rates for our export trade to South America. On the other hand, the foreign steamship companies, whose inferior vessels now run in the South American trade, are owned and controlled primarily in the interests of merchants and manufacturers of Europe."

GUNS AND AMMUNITION CARRIED IN FOREIGN SHIPS.

"Two 8-inch guns for the fortifications in the Philippines, 500 rifles, and 20,000 rounds of cartridges for the army in the island, were sent out in the *Nippon Maru*, which sailed yesterday for the Orient."

[From the San Francisco Recorder, April 2, 1908.]

The *Nippon Maru* is one of a line of three Japanese steamships crossing the Pacific Ocean, belonging to the Toyo Yusen Kaisha, and receiving a subvention from the Japanese Government of \$506,940 a year. The *Nippon Maru*, like her sisters, is a subsidized auxiliary cruiser of Japan, and was used as such in the war with Russia. She would be used as such in a war with the United States, and would be available to "burn, sink, and destroy" American transports and supply ships, if we could find them to convey our arms, ammunition, and troops to the Philippines.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MADDEN. To move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I had expected that I should have time in which to make some adequate reply to some of the fallacies that have been uttered and reiterated here on this floor; but as it is impossible now apparently to get the time, I ask unanimous consent, before proceeding at all, for leave to extend my remarks on this subject in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEIFER. I shall vote for the two battle ships recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and, while I do this, I have reached the conclusion that I do not, in any general sense, agree with the majority of the committee or the views of the minority [Mr. HOBSON] as to the necessity or lack of necessity for more battle ships.

The committee seem to strike a happy medium, and neither favor a large or small navy on either the Atlantic or the Pacific oceans, or in any of our waters either to wage an aggressive or carry on a defensive war should war unfortunately come. Denying that there is any present imminent danger of war, yet regarding it at all times possible, the committee seem to think a halfway preparation to meet it, should it come, is better than waiting supinely for that direful eventuality before setting about the preparation to successfully maintain it. The recent war with effete Spain is sometimes cited as an illustration of what we can do and have done. I do not accept this as at all satisfactory. Our condition now in relation to other nations with superior battle ships and fleets is rather to be compared to that of Spain to the United States when the Spanish war was declared. It is true that, with the prompt expenditure of \$50,000,000 toward the equipment and the purchase of ships, and so forth, and with our Navy then greatly superior to that of Spain in armor and armament, we were able to destroy the Spanish fleet in the Philippines and at Santiago without a real

naval engagement, and to thus seem to be a great world power on the high seas. These or like incidents are never to be repeated. In our then state of preparation we would never have dared to go to war with any real naval power of the world.

To make the illustration more complete we should take Spain as the example and her fate in that war as the warning. She had a navy composed of many once good, but then obsolete, ships and fighting vessels, and her fleets were in many waters; but her impotency for war was demonstrated to her dismay, first, within a week (May 1, 1898, at Manila) after the war was declared (April 25), and two months later (July 3) at Santiago her principal fleet was destroyed, to Spain's final and lasting humiliation. Spain's experience and fate afford only a moderate spectacle and a miniature example of what would befall this country should it be forced to go to war with even a third-rate power possessed of fleets superior to ours.

Notwithstanding the sentimental talk about it not being necessary for a nation to go armed as a measure of protection from attack, I reaffirm that manifest weakness invites aggression and insult, both of which lead to war. It is highly probable that had Spain possessed a fleet of equal strength to that of the United States war would not have been declared against her because of her inhumanity to her own subjects. Our country inaugurated (1898) a new cause for war. The Spanish war was the first and only one ever declared purely on humanitarian grounds in the history of nations. Other powers may not prove to be inspired by better or higher international ethics or principles than was the United States in 1898, and a cause for war is easily found by the strong against the weak. The jealous eye of monarchy has always been on our Republic. Its constitutional guaranties of individual liberty has long robbed tyrannical governments of their most virtuous and enterprising subjects.

Until there is international disarmament we must be in constant readiness to wage war and thereby insure peace.

The views and fears of the minority I do not entertain. I do not think that any nation is hunting for a fight with us either by sea or land. I do not, however, attribute this reluctance to assail us to a mere fear of us on account of our supposed strength, resting in a peace sentimentality born of a modern Christian civilization, but their fears come naturally from our capacity for war, shown by our achievements on the fields of blood in the Revolutionary war for independence, the defensive war of 1812, the Mexican war for acquisition, the civil war to maintain the Union, the war with Spain for humanity, to say nothing of a hundred years of Indian wars. We are a nation with bloody annals. The great powers of the earth have not forgotten our history, and will not until time is no more.

I believe in The Hague Peace Tribunal, and I will do all I can to foster its efforts to prevent war and to alleviate its barbarities when it comes, though there may be a danger that war may be so refined that it will be resorted to for recreation or for mere glory. Politeness in destroying life in war is absurd in the highest degree, and to advocate the preservation of the enemy's property while engaged in taking the life of its subjects is to favor regarding property above human life. The tendency to alleviate in war unnecessary suffering to combatants and noncombatants has been long advocated between Christian nations, and whatever can be done by international treaty or agreement to that end should be done. I do not here undertake to define the limits of efforts that should be made to lessen the horrors and suffering of war, but so long as war exists it will be directed principally toward the taking of human life, the destruction of property being an important incident as a means of exhausting and overcoming the enemy.

Armies are assembled, armed, disciplined, and trained to destroy life. Why not destroy property where it will hasten peace and prevent the effusion of blood? War will never be carried on politely. Rifles and cannon are not discharged, bayonets are not thrust, swords are not unshielded and wielded, and shells or bombs are not fired or exploded affectionately in battle, nor can any ethics of civilization devise any plan to make war otherwise than it has always been in this respect—a wholesale destroyer of human life. Let us not deceive ourselves and suppose war will ever be materially otherwise.

Until a peace congress of nations shall agree to require all the powers of the world to submit their disagreements, grievances, and claims to arbitration or to a permanent international court—the high court of The Hague—or tribunal and to make the decision reached and award made final, and to enforce it by combined war against a nation that may refuse to obey its mandates, decrees, or awards, such a congress will be impotent and nations will have to continue to be armed and ready to redress their own grievances. To this extent I

agree with my friend here, the distinguished peace advocate from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW]. Such a peace congress I most heartily indorse. (I am a member of the American group of Interparliamentary Unions.) This would result in some disarmament at least, and in general it might, and it is sincerely to be hoped would, secure peace between nations. That there will always have to be an army and navy, if for no other purpose than to act as a national or State police power on land and sea as an aid to the civil power is too plain for dispute. The ordinary civil power or constabulary force of States, counties, municipalities, courts, etc., without a disciplined and trained army ultimately behind it would prove to be too weak to cope with constantly occurring extraordinary conditions. Federal and State executive powers, legislative acts and judicial decrees, judgments, civil and criminal, would lack potentiality if there was not some final organized power to aid in enforcing them. Indeed, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our State and Federal governments would not long exist if there was no ultimate armed power to uphold them.

My colleague from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] says:

Our chiefest destinations * * * are the triumphs of commerce, of industry, and of science; that here * * * we have maintained the importance of the individual, and that we give respect and reverence to the teachings of Christianity. We have been at peace between nations.

He says:

The cause of him who is wronged is the strongest cause that can exist under heaven. When sympathy is aroused it is a factor more potent than armies.

That—

This is certainly true of the individual.

He inquires—

Why is it that chivalry gives such respect to the tender sex * * * our sheltering, our protecting hand does not go out to the Amazon? * * * No nation can afford to impose on a weak people. The public opinion of the civilized world is stronger than the armies and navies of the proudest empire.

That the whole civilized world would rise up and legions would crowd to the bar of nations crying "Hands off! Hands off!" if some nation of Europe should go to South America and seek to subject a weak people there.

He exclaims—

Talk about (England) sending battle ships up the difficult channels of the St. Lawrence!

Adding that—

There would be no boundary line between the United States and Canada by the time the battle ships got across the Atlantic.

These absurdities are again to-day reiterated in substance here.

I have summarized these only partially true sentimental fallacies as the best I have heard here in the advocacy of our Republic going unarmed as the proper mode of commanding the respect and influence of other nations. We cheer such talk here now, yet in the presence of danger or war we would not listen to it with patience. In so far as any element of practical truth enters into these sentimentalities they will do possibly for the lecture platform, for the purely peace advocates and on the hustings, but not to instruct or guide a legislative body where stubborn facts should be considered. Let us not deceive ourselves here, where duty in the light of existing conditions should guide us.

But how much of real truth is there in these statements tested by our history? Our moral power is exactly measured by our physical power. We have only moderate distinction in commerce, and no triumphs. Our commerce was driven from the high seas over forty years ago and our exports and imports are still carried in foreign bottoms in consequence of our having an inadequate Navy during the civil war. In general our triumphs of industry concern our home affairs and are aside from the question of preparedness for war. So of the importance of the individual, save as to his disposition to engage in war. And, however much we have revered the teachings of Christianity, we have the bloodiest of war history, and we fostered human slavery in its worst form longer in this land than it had existed in any other so-called "civilized country," and this in the afternoon of the nineteenth century. Within our borders, in the name of our Christian civilization, there was made the only attempt in all the ages to establish a nation in which the perpetuation of slavery was its chief object. And about one year in six, on an average, Indian wars excluded, of our nation's life has been a year of war. Surely "our respect and reverence for the teachings of Christianity" did not stay the direst of evils (human slavery) until the demon of war intervened to destroy it. Nor have we been, as stated by my distinguished colleague, "at peace between nations," nor with ourselves.

We found a cause for war with Mexico, a sister Republic, avowedly to acquire more territory to devote to the Moloch of slavery, and we depleted her of her richest and fairest possessions. We went to war with Spain for humanity's sake, declaring we did not seek conquest but we ended it by establishing a perpetual peace-protectorate over Cuba, by taking Porto Rico, and by acquiring more than 3,000 islands in the Philippines, halfway around the world. Our Indians wars have resulted in substantially destroying the Indian tribes and in dispossessing them of their homes and lands that a Christian people might inhabit them. Such have been the ethics of our Christian civilization. We assailed, long ago in the name of our civilization the Algerines and Moors on the shore of the Mediterranean. We have forced recognition of our nationality on China, also on Japan, now so grown in "world power" as to cause some Members on this floor to daily tremble for our country's safety.

Verily we have not been at peace "between nations."

The reason why the cause of the "wronged is the strongest cause that can exist under heaven," and the reason why sympathy aroused is "more potent than armies," and the reason why chivalry respects the "tenderer sex" is that noble Christian and natural sympathy of highly wrought civilized man develops that chivalry which springs to arms to defend and protect the wronged and the weak. The only reason why in individual cases "our protecting hand does not go out to the Amazon" is because she is strong and able to cope with her own adversaries—to fight her own battles.

The reason why in this age of civilization "no nation can afford to impose upon a weak people" is exemplified by our recently declaring war against Spain because of her inhumanity to her own subjects. If it be true that the "public opinion of the civilized world is stronger than the armies and navies of the proudest empire," it is because the civilized world "would crowd to the bar of nations crying, 'Hands off! Hands off!'" backed with their combined armies and navies, ready and willing, if necessary, to overthrow the transgressing empire. Example, the recent marching of the armies of the United States, united with those of the greatest and most civilized nations of Europe and of Japan, to Peking, the seat of the Chinese Empire, to protect and redress by actual war the wrongs of our imperiled Christian—Protestant and Catholic—missionaries and others.

And in the supposed case of an European nation attempting "to subject a weak people" in South America, we would invoke the Monroe doctrine and, with our Army and Navy, compel "hands off" with shot and shell. Thus only has the Monroe doctrine been upheld and to be held.

Also in the figure of speech exclamation about England "sending battle ships" up the St. Lawrence and the boundary line between the United States and Canada disappearing, my colleague failed to tell us that the Army and Navy, backed by the yeomanry of the Republic, would spring to arms, and this North American continent would be on fire, as of old, with war and preparation for war. So all there is of that sentiment which woos peace leads inevitably to actual war in every eventuality.

President Roosevelt, in his last message to Congress, quotes that part of Washington's Farewell Address out of which has been evolved that common saying attributed to the Father of his Country, "In time of peace, prepare for war." I have here on a former occasion dissented from this saying as being, at least now, behind the age. It is in consonance with modern civilization to substitute for it another—in time of peace, prepare to maintain it. The result of all investigations is that our Republic must be ready for war to avoid war.

But battle ships are not all we require to adequately insure a peace by land or sea. I earnestly believe it is at least of equal importance to them that we should so fortify Subic Bay as to secure our holding Manila and Manila Bay, that Pearl Harbor should be made as impregnable as Gibraltar, and that we should close in like manner the mouth of Chesapeake Bay against the navies of the world, thereby safeguarding Washington and the great cities on this great bay. All this would be accomplished quicker than a modern up-to-date battle ship can be constructed and floated with a complement of armament, and probably at less cost.

Manila lost involves the certain loss of the Philippines; Pearl Harbor in possession of another naval power, involves the loss of the Hawaiian Territory, and exposes and endangers our entire Pacific coast; Chesapeake Bay, open as now, invites, in case of war, a foreign fleet to enter and convey an army to the gates of this Capital, and to other cities unless our Navy is strong enough to repel them and is constantly kept on that duty.

It follows that with these important places in safe condition

a less number of battle ships will be required, and these strategic places could be thus perpetually maintained, while the life of a great battle ship is, at best, short, and in five or ten years it is likely to become entirely useless.

I believe in our Republic; in its flag, which I have followed in war about five years; in its glory, which I have enjoyed; in its Constitution, which has shielded me and mine through a long life; and in its destiny, which belongs to eternity; but not alone as a nation to be perpetuated as a world war power, but as a world peace power; and I believe neither such power is attainable or maintainable save by a recognition of existing and real conditions, created by the environment other great and influential nations of the earth have placed around us.

Let us do our duty as legislators in this emergency with the best lights obtainable, erring, if err we must, on the side of the Republic and in preserving it from humiliation and disaster, to the end that it may ever be first in all things that preserve and perpetuate the universal liberty and rights of man. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FASSETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I beg only for five minutes of indulgence, and probably you will be glad and I will be glad that the rule limits me to five minutes. I do not know, and I know of no man who does know, whether there is imminent danger of war or a long-continued peace. Every true American must pray for peace. Every true lover of mankind must pray and work for peace, but we should be deaf to the teachings of history if we dared predicate all our actions on even a lively hope that peace might permanently endure. There is room on this question for honest differences of opinion. Opinions do honestly differ as to the situation, opinions do honestly differ as to the measure of protection which we should take, but history teaches me that unarmed justice has since the beginning of the race been a beggar among men and the nations of men. I admire those eternal principles of justice which little by little through agony and fire and blood and war have been established, but I challenge the gentlemen to point to one of them which has not been secured by infinite struggle, waste, death, suffering, tears, and blood. I do not know whether there is to be war or not. I do not know whether four battle ships are necessary or two battle ships are best. I know that if they should be necessary any consideration of mere dollars, any consideration of mere expense, is but trifling with a serious situation. When experts disagree we are the jury. The Commander in Chief, not of the Congress, but of the Army and Navy, has put it up to this House to decide. We are not experts, but we are the jury, and as one of the jurymen the whole argument sums itself up to me in this way: We have to guess, and we may guess wrong. I would rather guess four battle ships to-day and find out that we needed two battle ships to-morrow than to guess two battle ships to-day and find out that we needed four battle ships to-morrow. [Applause.] We dare not face the consequences of a mistake on the wrong side, and if the first guess were wrong it would cost our country only \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000, prematurely expended, but if we guessed wrong in deciding on two battle ships it might cost our country and our children and our heritage irreparable damage and irreparable loss. [Applause.] And when we are faced with a condition like this it is no time to go into idle academics as to the potential efficiency of unarmed justice. All the triumphs of history, all the brilliant pages of man's record, have been written not by unarmed justice, but by justice with the flaming sword. [Applause.] Justice with flaming sword emancipated us; it emancipated the slave. It has emancipated him wherever he has cowered since history's dawn, and the flaming sword must be the dependence of the right. Ideas are stronger than men, but ideas operate through men. They are born in the brains of men; they are established by the devotion of men, and our business here is not to quibble about two gunboats. It is broader than that; it is a question of the peace of the nation. It is possibly a question of the peace of the world. The way has been pointed right. Our duty is to follow according to our best convictions. I only regret that I can not by the same vote establish an adequate merchant marine in order to help our Navy in times of trouble. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOESON] providing for four battle ships, because in the discharge of my personal responsibility as a member of this body I believe that the present conditions make that duty imperative upon me. I have great admiration and respect for the gentlemen here who have advocated a contrary policy, but I desire to call the attention of this committee to the fact that if gentlemen here claim to be standing by the policy which was inaugurated in regard to naval construction one or two years ago—for some reason, which

has not been explained on the floor of this committee, the great Naval Affairs Committee of this House is advocating the construction of two battle ships—that policy contemplated only one. Considering many phases of our foreign relations, I am convinced our Navy should be strengthened.

There are, Mr. Chairman, in matters of this sort, some things that ought not to be agitated too much. I do not believe it is within the sphere of my duty as a Member of the American Congress to raise the red flag of war, but I can not rid myself of the sworn responsibility to take every reasonable precaution which in my judgment is necessary to provide for the defense of my country and for the honor of my flag. [Loud applause.] The American Navy has throughout the past been uniformly triumphant from the days when John Paul Jones fought beneath its standard on the bloody decks of ships unworthy of any navy in British waters, and from that day to this, when our fleet of battle ships ride the waters of the Pacific, our Navy has ever been uniformly victorious. But its victories have not come so much from the strength of our naval armaments as they are due to the indomitable courage and accurate marksmanship of our seamen and the matchless skill and daring of their commanders. While I believe this high standard of service still exists in the Navy, it is my duty to place the brave defenders of my country where their skill and daring will not prove unavailing in the hour of conflict.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], in his address a few moments ago, said that the conflict which he feared was not so much, as I understood him, a war inspired by oriental nations as between oriental people and western people.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], on the floor of this House a few days ago, said, in substance, in case war with an oriental power comes, the cause of America will be the cause of Europe.

Sir, when Russia was struggling in the throes of a desperate conflict with Japan we gave no sympathy to Russia, and it seems idle to me that we should rely upon a proposition of that sort, that Russia and her allies should extend to us what we so recently withheld from her. If we are to have a navy, it should be strong enough, under the circumstances that now surround us, under the obligations that now devolve upon us, in our foreign relations as they now exist and as the future gives promise of their continuing, to maintain a defensive attitude on both our coast lines. Every part of the United States is equally sacred, and it is of equal importance that we should prepare for the defense of the Pacific coast as we should that of the Atlantic slope. I come from an interior State, where no enemy could ever put a foot on an inch of its soil; but every foot of American soil is equally sacred to me. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, on May 10, 1906, a debate took place on the floor of this House on this very same question. At that time I was catechised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] for taking the position in favor of the construction of one battle ship. I have not the time to read the running debate which occurred between the gentleman and myself, but he endeavored to insinuate by his questions that I had received orders from some one, evidently referring to the White House, to support the policy of building the one battle ship, and as an advocate of arbitration and peace I could not afford to do so. I answered him that I had received orders from no one, and was acting on my own conscientious judgment. Since that time I have had no opportunity to prove that my position was consistent, but to-day I welcome the double opportunity of proving not only my own consistency but the inconsistency of the gentleman from New York. [Applause.]

I voted for one battle ship then, and I shall vote for one more battle ship to-day. [Applause.] The gentleman at that time voted for no battle ships, and he is ready to vote for four battle ships to-day. At that time the gentleman insisted that it is the duty of every Member to exercise his own individual judgment in casting a vote upon so important a question; while to-day he began his speech with a reference to the fact that the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy was responsible for the vote he would cast on this question. [Laughter and applause.]

So much for that. Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House, I am sure, realizes that this is a most important juncture in the history of our national development. We have reached the crossroads, and the question is, Shall we continue on the pathway of American tradition or shall we follow the lead of European monarchies? Shall we look to armaments to vouchsafe national security and peace, or shall we place our reliance

in the future, as in the past, upon our inherent strength, our righteousness, our sense of justice, and other civic virtues?

For more than a hundred years the policies of the fathers of the Republic have guided us safely through the vicissitudes of our national life as well as our international relations, and, for one, I would rather listen to the voice of Washington dead, Jefferson dead, and Lincoln dead than to that of all the crowned war lords of the world living to-day. [Applause.] I am certain our future will be just as secure as has been our past if we rely, as did the fathers, upon the stout hearts of the American people rather than upon ironclads. [Applause.]

I can not help but think that an appeal for unnecessary increases of armaments is an appeal to those instincts of human nature which it is our mission to repress rather than to stimulate. It stirs the fighting animal in man which it is the task of culture to keep subdued. Let us remember that all there is of our boasted civilization, besides the mere technical achievements, is the power of self-control, and that the degree to which we have learned to exercise it is the real measure of our culture. This is true of nations as well as individuals, but the exercise of that splendid virtue, while aided by peaceful agreements with our neighbors, is rendered most difficult by the temptation to which excessive armaments constantly subject those whose province it is to put them to use.

It is asserted with the emphasis of honest conviction that peace can only be maintained by preparations for war. If this were still true to-day, then we are bound to admit that no progress whatever has been made during the last thousand years, for the rulers of all periods of history have made exactly the same assertion, and have at all times misused the name of peace to exact money from the people for war preparations. If it were true, there would be no need of peace conferences, treaties, and international agreements, because each nation would simply rely upon its armed strength instead of seeking an understanding to get along peacefully with all other nations. If justice and peace is really the object sought, there is another way to secure it, much more economical, more humane, and more in harmony with the spirit of modern civilization. The Hague Conference has agreed to leave the negotiation of arbitration treaties to the powers. There is absolutely no obstacle in the way of an American administration to negotiate such treaties with all powers and agree to arbitrate all questions without exception, provided territorial integrity and home sovereignty is mutually guaranteed to and by all. And not a single battle ship will be needed for us to set this good example to the civilized world, while the American President who will carry out this plan would make himself immortal. [Applause.]

Certain it is, Mr. Chairman, that after we have sufficiently provided for national defense, every step beyond that to increase armaments is inconsistent with the movement to secure peace by a judicial process. It is the old seesaw, when armaments go up, arbitration and justice will go down; and when arbitration and justice go up armaments will go down. It is impossible, what my distinguished friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] proposes, namely, to make both ends go up at the same time.

Our naval policy has been fixed last year and two years ago by an agreement on one battle ship a year, and on this platform I stand to-day, believing it to afford ample protection in view of the fact that the possibilities of war have not only not increased, but have been greatly lessened by The Hague agreements. And mind you, gentlemen, that naval programme was agreed upon after the conclusion of the Russian-Japanese war—that is, after Japan's great victories, and at a time when we were fully aware, as we are to-day, that the United States is bounded by two oceans instead of one.

With all due deference to those who can not agree with me, I predict that the time will come, and it may not be very far off, when the American people will generally approve the attitude of those who resist extravagant naval programmes. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object for the purpose of making an explanation, I will say that while I was out in the hall a moment ago several gentlemen upon my side and one, I believe, on the other side got leave to print.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Gentlemen on both sides.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That being so, I shall not object now, because it would look unfair; but I want merely to explain that that was due to the accident of my being out of my seat, and that I shall hereafter object to any requests to print in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that it may be necessary for the gentleman to be in the Hall when the request is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman knew that, and did not need the advice of the Chair. The gentleman was making an explanation, in order that the House might understand his future conduct and not his past.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Do we understand that leave was granted to all gentleman who speak or have spoken on this subject?

The CHAIRMAN. No such request has been granted or submitted.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I am here as a Representative in part of one of the States of the Pacific coast. As such Representative I feel it my duty, not only from my own convictions, but because I know that I am voicing the sentiments of a very large majority of the people of my State, to declare to this committee that the people of the Pacific coast desire an authorization to build four battle ships at this time.

We are moved to this sentiment not from any desire of conquest, not because we fear an immediate encroachment of any enemy, but because for a long time we have been sensible of our defenseless condition, being off on the far Western rim of the country, and we desire, in accordance with the suggestion of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, that the Navy may be so increased that we shall not hereafter be left in this defenseless condition. Mr. Chairman, at this time the Navy of the United States, manned by the valor of American manhood, is upon the Pacific coast. Our people welcome this Navy with shouts of patriotic acclaim; they are glad to see it not only from patriotic considerations, but because, having seen it and realized that it is in our waters, they feel a sense of security that for several years past they have not been able to feel.

We feel that an expenditure of a few million dollars for the erection of battle ships is a very small price to pay for peace either upon the Atlantic Ocean or upon the Pacific Ocean. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] this morning voiced the sentiments of the people on the Pacific coast, and stated in more eloquent language than I can hope to state the conditions existing there, and I want to say, in justice to him, that the speech which he delivered two years ago in this House was delivered before the present conditions had fully developed on the Pacific coast. At this time there is an acute race question upon the Pacific coast, which is becoming daily more acute. Our people are demanding that they be saved from submergence by the hordes of the Orient now coming to take possession of the country west of the Rocky Mountains. We intend to insist upon this; we intend to continue to insist upon it. We do not, Mr. Chairman, intend to divide the soil of the States over on the Pacific coast with the yellow race, but we intend to demand and cry out on this floor until the people of the United States hear our cry and grant us the only relief that is possible under the circumstances, to wit, an oriental-exclusion act.

It has been stated by gentlemen on the floor during this discussion that this matter of oriental immigration was already being settled so far as the Japanese are concerned, because Japan is taking care that her people do not hereafter come to the Pacific coast. Nothing is further from the truth. Japan has frequently given us assurance that she would prevent this immigration, and she has as repeatedly failed to keep these pledges. Last year, in spite of the pledge she gave to the Government of the United States that she would prevent her laborers coming to this country, more than double the number of Japanese came to this country than ever came in any one year before in the history of the world—more than double the number who had come the year before. More than 30,000 came directly from Japan with passports, in spite of the assurance of the Government of Japan, and nearly all of them, or practically all of them, were coolies or laborers. During the last three months, in spite of the renewed assurances last fall from Japan that she was inaugurating and intending to enforce new and more rigorous regulations in order to prevent immigration, it is certain that during the last three months more than 5,000 Japanese have come to the Pacific coast. In the month of January of this year 1,419 Japanese immigrants came to this country directly from Japan with passports, of whom 792 were admittedly coolies. In February, 1,232 came, of whom 713 were coolies. I have not the figures for March. Besides many have come over the borders from Canada and Mexico, and they are still coming both from Japan and from Canada and Mexico. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California also asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEAKE. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the minority leader, I shall have to object.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I hope the gentleman will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. To which request does the gentleman from New Jersey object?

Mr. LEAKE. I object to the request put by the Chair when I rose.

The CHAIRMAN. But there were two requests; one from the gentleman from Texas and one from the gentleman from California. The Chair is entitled to be dealt with frankly. The Chair put two requests.

Mr. MACON. I object to the other request.

Mr. LEAKE. If the two requests were put together I object to both of them. I object to the request whatever it was.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made and consent is refused to both gentlemen.

[Mr. SLAYDEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the conditions of the past are not the conditions of to-day. Isolation was the defense of this continent in the past, but isolation is at an end. The waters of the sea are but the servants of steam and of fleets which could land a hundred thousand men on our shores within ten days.

Our territory is not invulnerable. New York was held by the British during the Revolutionary war. Washington was captured in the war of 1812. We took San Francisco in 1845-48 with a navy alone, just as any navy that can sail past her forts could take it to-day, and our wealth lies largely in our great cities near the seacoast—more so than is so of any other great country.

In the past we had no outside isolated possessions. Let no man tell me that we care not for Hawaii or for the Philippine Islands. Perhaps we sympathize with that view, but we do not intend to have any other power take them from us. But what of Panama and the canal? What say you, also, to Alaska, which is provisioned from this country and only accessible by sea except through territory of the ally of another power—Alaska, with its fisheries and its mines of gold, silver, copper, iron, and coal?

We are told that there have been no conquests recently, except by the agreement of the civilized world. Start in the Far East and count those conquests. Is it Korea, large parts of China, and Manchuria and Burmah? Is it the whole of Africa, including Egypt? Is it the provinces of Turkey, including Greece? Is it the whole of Italy or Germany and a large part of France? Mr. Chairman, the conquests of the last century, the changes of possession by reason of power, exceed those of any century within the last four or five.

I do not speak as to details. The Executive and the Department think that we need four new battle ships to maintain the prestige of the American Navy for the defense of American honor, and of America if need be. I shall vote with the decision of that Executive. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLETT. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I stand before this committee in the spirit of apology for the President. The remarks I have made for some time past have been largely those of criticism, not because of the things he proposes, but because of the means he uses in endeavoring to carry them out. In a large measure I must continue that spirit here at this time. I agree with the President most emphatically in his recommendation for four battle ships instead of two, or any number less than four. I agree with him that our Navy needs these battle ships. As the multitude of reasons why we should have them have been so clearly, definitely, and logically presented to this committee, I am not at this time going to reiterate them or try to bring them home with any new force, but there is one point in connection with this proposition that I feel it is my duty to present with all the clearness possible. In the first place, the President in the message presented to this House yesterday recommended that four battle ships be built. The difficulty with the President in this proposition is the old difficulty that has always been present with him when he proposes anything,

and that is in the method and the means by which he endeavors to impress upon the minds of this House his purpose and plan and ambition. A few days ago the committee, or a number of the Members of this House, were present at the White House with a large number of other visitors, and the President, with his customary vehemence, said that—

Unless you give to me my four battle ships, I will veto your public buildings bill.

Now, there is the difficulty, as I say, underlying the surface here. The man who sits in the White House, who has the veto power, has used this threat—which is nothing more nor less than significant in the face of the conditions which confront us—to impose a burden and take away from the people of this nation a great benefit unless his will is accomplished. Now, I say that I feel perfectly free to offer this criticism—

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman just yield for a short question?

Mr. WILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HOBSON. Out of consideration for the President I desire to say that I happened to see him a moment after he first said that, and he said he said it because a Member had just told him that, while he was in favor of four battle ships, he had been practically forced to give them up because he had been told that unless the two battle ships were cut off they would not be allowed to bring in a public buildings bill. That is the reason why the President said it, and he said it under provocation. The opposition has used tactics in this House that ought not to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, that was a dramatic situation which we witnessed in this House just before adjournment last evening. Two messages were received, one from the President of the United States and the other from certain citizens from the city of New York. The message from the President of the United States was a plea for a larger Navy. The message from the citizens of New York was a protest against a larger Navy. The message from the citizens of New York which we received yesterday evening reminded me of a message we received from them ten years ago, just upon the outbreak of the Spanish-American war. The rumor came across the seas that a flotilla of torpedo boats was heading toward this country from Madrid. No sooner did that rumor reach our shores than some of the same gentleman, some of whose names I recognize on this petition, started with their message for Washington, and here on bended knee they begged and beseeched the President of the United States and the American Congress to send to New York City, not one battle ship nor two battle ships, but the entire American Navy [applause] to protect the lives, property, and treasure of the people of New York. We heeded not their plea, and as a result I am told that those who could packed up their treasure, carried it into the interior, and waited until all signs of danger had disappeared. What would the citizens of New York City not have given at that time for two *Oregons* 10 miles off shore at that time? [Applause.] A supreme moment comes frequently in the life of every nation. One of these supreme moments came in 1898. That was when we wanted a navy; that was when we needed a navy; and it is to protect my country against one of these supreme moments which I feel may come in the near future that I am going to vote for this amendment for four battle ships. [Applause.] If it were to be announced from The Hague Tribunal or from some other tribunal to-morrow that the leading nations of the earth had agreed to disarm their armies and dismantle their ships, I would rejoice and be exceeding glad.

But they do nothing of the kind. They meet at The Hague and talk peace and arbitration and disarmament, and then they go home and build battle ships. Great Britain talked peace and disarmament, and the dismantlement of her navy, and went home and is now building ten battle ships and has ordered two more. France talked peace, disarmament, and the dismantlement of her navy, and then went home and is building six battle ships and has ordered six more. Germany is building five battle ships and has ordered four more; her plan for next year contemplates four more, and the next year four more, and so on until 1917. Japan has talked peace, disarmament, and the dismantlement of her battle ships, and is now building four battle ships and has ordered seven more. Russia has entered upon a programme that contemplates the expenditure of \$1,000,000,000 for a navy. I am utterly unable to reconcile these pretensions for peace with these preparations and practices for war. I have faith and confidence in the President of the United States. I am willing to trust his wisdom and patriotism, and I shall answer his plea for four battle ships by voting for this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object.

Mr. LANDIS. I will ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. LEAKE. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] is recognized.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, if I believed it was for the good of my country that we should authorize the construction of a hundred battle ships at this session of Congress, I would willingly, nay gladly, vote for that number. But, sir, I have sat here for several days listening to the wild speculations of gentlemen upon this floor about war, not a single one of which has had any foundation in fact upon which to rest, and no sane reason has been given why we should authorize four battle ships at this time. Nothing whatever has been said that has caused me to think for one moment that there is any more danger of war between the United States and a foreign country than I believe there is danger of war between the Members of this House upon the adoption or defeat of the pending amendment. Ever since I was 10 years of age I have heard it predicted that a war between the two races of the South was almost as certain as death, and that when it did come the white race of that section would be annihilated.

Gentlemen, if we had believed such idle declarations about a race war, we would have bankrupted the South in preparing for it; but we knew them to be wild and visionary and that there was no danger of war between the whites and blacks of the South, and hence we did not tax ourselves out of existence in order to prepare for a war that has not and will never take place. The same character of war visionaries now warn us that there is danger of war between the United States and the yellow man of the East. Gentlemen, there is no more danger, in my humble judgment, of a war between the United States and Japan than there is of a war between the two races of the South. But should there be war between the yellow man and the American people, I have no more doubt about the result than I would have about the result of a war between the races of the South, which would be the extermination of the black man rather than of the man of Caucasian blood.

Ah, gentlemen, I have heard of the bogey man all my life. The prophecy about war with Japan is nothing more nor less than a bogey man that the jingoes of this country are using for the purpose of trying to frighten us into voting to give them a navy that is to their liking, even though it bankrupts the Treasury of the people to do it. The prophecy about a war between Japan and America frightens no one who stops and thinks and reasons for himself. My countrymen, do not be alarmed by the idle talk of a war with the yellow man, for it will never take place. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLETT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I merely desire to say, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will reserve his objection, that this is the first time at this session of Congress that I have asked for more than five minutes, and I can not possibly conclude in less than ten. I will not exceed ten minutes. I have never yet asked to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. WILLETT. I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] asks unanimous consent to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, notwithstanding the very able arguments that have been made against this proposition, notwithstanding also some of the arguments that have been made for it, I am in favor of four battle ships. [Laughter and applause.] The debate on this question has been the most instructive and illuminating, I think, of any debate that has been had on any question before the House this session; and yet gentlemen equally able to discuss the matter from all points of view have been as far apart as the poles. This suggests to me that there must be some middle ground upon which those of us who pretend to no expert knowledge on either side of the question may meet; a middle ground

upon which those of us who are not animated by the almost fanatical enthusiasm that has been displayed on both sides of the question may safely stand. At one extreme we find the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], who really wants at least six battle ships, but is willing to compromise on four as an "irreducible minimum." At the other extreme we find the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who really wants no battle ships at all, but is willing to compromise on one, as what might be called an "unincreasable maximum." [Laughter.]

Now, plainly, both these gentlemen can not be right. Is it not within the bounds of probability that they are both wrong and that the logical and reasonable ground lies somewhere between the two? Is it to be found, then, in the proposition recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to build two battle ships, or that involved in the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama to build four battle ships? Pretending to no such expert knowledge as that possessed by the gentleman from Alabama or other member of the Committee on Naval Affairs; pretending to no such expert knowledge as that possessed by the gentleman from Minnesota and other gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations of the financial condition of this country; condemning equally jingoism and what some people call anti-imperialism, I shall vote for four battle ships because I deem it my duty to my constituency and my country. [Applause.]

That I should be in disagreement with the gentleman from Alabama on account of our respective seats on opposite sides of this aisle is not remarkable, as we differ on many questions of public policy. That I should be in such substantial disagreement with my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] causes me grave concern; for upon almost all matters of great public policy I fully agree with him, and upon the question which, in my judgment, is the greatest before the American people and will be for the next six months, and which is of the most inestimable interest to the people of Ohio, we are in exact accord. [Laughter and applause.]

I can not help thinking that the title of this section is to an extent misleading. I do not think that the building of two battle ships under all the circumstances would amount to a real increase of the Navy. Last year the question was whether we should build battle ships of the *Dreadnought* class or whether we should continue to build what would have amounted to second-class battle ships. We decided in favor of the *Dreadnought* class; and now all the other great nations of the world are building them. It is not so much the addition of ships to the number we already have as the question of the kind of ships we are building and what we are doing in comparison with what other nations are doing that determines whether we are really increasing the Navy or not.

Let us not forget that after the close of the civil war we continued to build ships and yet continued to fall behind the other nations, until at one time we ranked even below Chile as a naval power. Now that it has been decided by the naval authorities of the world that the strength of a navy depends upon battle ships, and that a ship of the *Dreadnought* class is the equivalent of at least three old-time battle ships, we must look to what the other nations are doing to determine whether we are increasing our Navy or even maintaining it at its present standard.

The facts are that at the close of this year, according to the figures given by the gentleman from Alabama, England will have authorized twelve battle ships of the first class, France twelve, Germany thirteen, and Japan eleven. To-day this country has only authorized two such ships, and their building has hardly more than begun.

To accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, that we should only build one battle ship a year, is to ignore entirely the question as to whether we shall maintain our rank with other naval powers. The basis of the gentleman's argument is that the United States should take advantage of its magnificent isolation to lead the world in the paths of peace. With great island possessions in the Atlantic Ocean, with great island possessions in the Pacific Ocean, with an announced policy of extending our foreign trade particularly with the Orient and to maintain the open door in China, can we still speak of our magnificent isolation? On the contrary, the events of the past ten years have forced us, whether we wanted it or not, into the front rank as a world power, and I, for one, am proud of it.

A few days ago this House unanimously passed a bill to establish the greatest naval base in the world at Pearl Harbor, 3,000 miles out in the Pacific. Can our magnificent isolation be invoked as a reason for doing that? Still farther westward are the Philippine Islands. We are spending there millions of dollars every year, and by this very bill are appropriating large

sums for naval bases there. Can we do this and still talk about our magnificent isolation?

I do not believe that any other nation wants the Philippines. We are not all agreed as to whether we want them ourselves [applause], or, if we do, how long we want to keep them; but certainly there is no one of us who would permit another nation to take them from us. [Applause.] There is hardly an American citizen who would not shed his last drop of blood to prevent any other nation hauling down our flag there or anywhere else. [Applause.]

I am not oppressed with the fears that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] entertains of a yellow peril. I have never been able to see any indication of the hatred to which he alludes of the Japanese people for us. On the contrary, I believe that the Japanese people have a cordial regard and respect for this country, just as we of this country have for Japan. Certainly no citizens of any foreign country were ever received by the citizens of another country with more genuine hospitality than were those of us who visited Japan three years ago on our way to the Philippines. There is nothing in the history of Japan or in Japanese character that makes the supposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], in my opinion, conceivable. [Applause.] Still we must realize that the Caucasian race and the yellow race never have and never will amalgamate. We know that there are many Japanese on the Pacific coast, and if many more should come, we can not conceal from ourselves that it is within the bounds of possibility that a situation might arise that would bring on a war which all the best and most honorable efforts of this Government and that of Japan would be powerless to avert.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] argues that no strong nation can afford to impose upon a weak people, that the public opinion of the civilized world is stronger than armaments, that if some strong nation should oppress a weak people the nations of the world would arise and cry "Hands off." Was it so when the little Boer Republic was at war with Great Britain? Was it so in Armenia, when tens of thousands of women and children were slaughtered in cold blood? Was it so in Cuba, where the people were for years oppressed by the tyranny of Spain, and where the population fell off almost a million souls?

[The time of Mr. LONGWORTH having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended one minute.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. The conditions there did not cease until this nation not only cried "Hands off!" but backed up the demand with a competent navy and put the Spanish hands off by force. Does anyone contend that if we had not had a navy somewhere nearly the equal of Spain's our demand would have been anything more than a pure bluff?

There is no Member of this House who is gifted with universal knowledge. As a body we are not infallible, and where our own doctors disagree as widely as they do now, is it not wise to pay heed to the recommendations of this Administration? After all, the direct responsibility for preserving peace is theirs more than it is ours. Is it not possible that they have a more thorough knowledge of the necessity for building four battle ships than we have? The President of the United States is interested in this question more than any other question before Congress. Practically all of us on this side of the House, and many on that, urged as our special plea for election that we would stand by the President. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that his time be extended one minute. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKER of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Dakota arise?

Mr. PARKER of South Dakota. To ask that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended for five minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I only want one minute. We will never have the opportunity to show—

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, there have been no extensions beyond the five minutes, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is too late. The Chair waited a long time.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I stated my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. We will never have a better opportunity to prove the sincerity of our professions than we have right now. There is nothing of politics or public buildings in this question; only patriotism. I would not for a moment ask

any man to sacrifice his honest convictions in this matter, but those of you who are perplexed by a conflict of authority, those of you who are in doubt as to what you should do, it seems to me, can safely resolve your doubts in favor of the recommendation of this Administration. Vote for four battle ships, and you will be standing by the President. [Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate and have endeavored to ascertain, if I could, some good reason for this proposed extraordinary increase in our Navy. I was inclined to think that perhaps the Government had some information rendering it important or necessary that this country should prepare for defense against the encroachments of some other power; I was inclined to think that it might be possible that war clouds were hovering over this land, and that it was imperative that provisions should be made against such a contingency. Judging from the vigor with which some gentlemen have advocated four battle ships, I have thought that it might be known by some that that precise number would be needed. I have thought that someone somewhere in the Government might know that we were in danger of attack from some other country; that we might be in danger of being, all unprepared, plunged into war. I have heard upon this floor no reason whatever why we should be in fear of any other nation upon the globe. As a member of this body, I have received no information, and it appears to me that there is no information that would justify this extraordinary expense on the part of this Government. If there was any information in the possession of the Government that would justify this extraordinary increase in our naval armament, it would seem to me that such information would have been communicated to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that that committee would have reported a bill providing for all necessary equipment.

I am inclined, Mr. Chairman, to rely on the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I am unwilling to believe that it is necessary or expedient for this country to go to the expense of constructing four additional battle ships in times of profound peace. The people of this country will not justify us in imposing upon them the great burden of this extraordinary increase in our naval armament unless good reason exists therefor. If any gentleman on the floor, or anywhere in this Government, was able to give us any reason for it, or to show that there was any danger whatever that this Government might be involved in war, or that our institutions or our liberties were at stake, then I, with 85,000,000 of other people in this land, would advocate that, not only four battle ships, but 400 battle ships if necessary should be provided for the protection of our liberties, our institutions, and our Government. But, Mr. Chairman, we are living in days of profound peace, when all the world is engaged, not in war, but in promoting the arts of peace. There is no war anywhere in the world, and the peoples of the world, as I believe, are not inclined to war, but to the promotion and advancement of civilized government. There is no prospect that war will come within the next decade at least. We do not desire the acquisition of territory, and no country on the face of the earth has anything that we covet, and no country in Europe, Asia, or Africa contemplates declaring war on the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we have long boasted that this country stands in the forefront of the civilized nations of the earth; that it leads in all the paths of peace. Let us, by our acts, not belie that boast.

It has been argued in support of this amendment that the building of a great navy is for peace, and not for war. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], in his speech just made upon this floor, has said that he is utterly unable to reconcile the pretensions of peace of other countries with their practices for war. He contradicts entirely the arguments of those who advocate a great navy to promote peace and not war. He cites what other countries are doing in building great navies, ridiculing the idea that the building of great navies is for the preservation of the peace, but says it is a preparation for war. So if we go on striving to build a greater navy than that of any other country, are we apt to convince those other countries that this means peace rather than war? If you put a shotgun into the hands of a child and turn him loose with that shotgun, is it to be supposed that he will not desire to shoot? So if we go on increasing our Navy as is proposed by this amendment, will other countries believe that we are doing this solely as a measure of peace and not as a preparation for war? Mr. Chairman, I am profoundly impressed with the idea that this American Republic is leading and should lead in the civilization of the world. I do not think we should make any effort to impress the peoples of the world with our strength and our military power. A very small proportion of what we are ex-

pending upon our Navy would put a commercial fleet on the seas of the world, and the American flag would be seen in other lands and recognized in a different manner from when it is seen only upon vessels of war. [Applause.]

To-day we have no merchant marine, and our flag is seen upon the seas of the world only upon war vessels. We have a great fleet encircling the globe to impress nations with our military greatness. I am glad indeed that we are recognized throughout the world as the greatest nation upon the face of the earth, but instead of war ships encircling the globe, I would rather see the flag of this Union in the forefront of the commercial fleets which sail the seas that surround the globe. And I would rather that the flag of this Union should be recognized everywhere around the world and among all its people as the emblem of a free and enlightened Government, carrying no suspicion of war or conquest or of a desire therefor, but rather known in all lands as a harbinger of peace on earth, good will to men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this amendment having been directed so largely at myself, I deem it proper to notice the main feature of it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] appears to have voiced it by reading from a speech delivered by me two years ago. Perhaps I should begin by explaining that if there were inconsistency between the position taken by me at any time and the one I conceive it to be my duty that I should take now, I would not hesitate one moment in choosing to be right rather than remain consistent. Rather than violate my duty as I see it, I would be quite ready to confess that in taking the other attitude I was wrong. [Applause.] But any gentleman who can stand on this floor and find anything inconsistent between the speech read by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] and that which I made this morning, goes far toward justifying that reproach so often leveled against Members on this side, and which we consider unfair and injurious, that it is impossible for them to learn anything. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I took that ground two years ago, and I repeat every sentiment of it now. Then there was not a cloud upon the horizon that I could discover or anyone point out, and therefore I saw no reason why we should undertake to establish a permanent fighting force. I spoke to little purpose this morning if I failed to show that a grave change has come over our situation, and as our situation has changed I have changed with it. I might remind the gentleman from Illinois, and such others of my countrymen as have thought my course worthy of notice or remembrance, that I have advocated armaments before to-day and before delivering the speech which was read with so much evident amusement and, I hope, with equal profit. In 1896, before Mr. Cleveland's term expired, in a public meeting at Chickering Hall—the first in favor of intervention by this country in Cuba—I advised the Administration to arm then, so that its advice might have such weight with Spain that actual hostilities would be avoided.

The moment that contest was over, at a public meeting in the Academy of Music—the first to protest against forcible annexation of the Philippines—I urged disarmament, for there was no longer, in my judgment, any occasion for maintaining a huge fighting establishment. I see a danger now which I have endeavored to describe, and for that reason I urge construction of these battle ships at this moment as a precaution which may avert the peril confronting us, just as I believed if similar precautions were taken in 1896 they would have made actual war unnecessary. Should exclusion of the Japanese be accomplished, I would advocate disarmament again, for then the sky over our heads would once more be cloudless.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. I yield to the gentleman if the committee will indulge me with sufficient time afterwards.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, just there I want to say—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. COCKRAN. I can not, unless I be allowed sufficient time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, with every word that has been said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], or by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], or by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER], on the general proposition that we can under ordinary conditions maintain peace without armament, I am in heartiest concurrence. I apprehend no difficulty with any European nation, or, indeed, with any government. I do not believe our security can ever be endangered from that source. I believe that if this country were in

trouble to-morrow with any European nation and transportation of our products across the Atlantic were obstructed, other nations would be forced to intervene, not through love of us, but that they might obtain the basic materials of manufacture and the foodstuffs which are the necessities of life produced on this soil. I do not believe the Japanese Government contemplates any aggression against us. I believe it would deplore any condition such as I have described, just as much as I know that our Government would deplore it.

But when gentlemen from the Pacific coast, one and all, stand here and tell you that while no other government covets anything that we have, yet that the people subject to another government do covet something we possess, and that is access to our soil, which our own people are not willing to concede, will you, gentlemen of the South, with a racial question of your own so momentous that you have found it necessary to lynch the Constitution in order to maintain your civilization [laughter and applause]—will you, gentlemen, turn then a deaf ear to the expostulations of your brethren on the Pacific coast who are now threatened with a danger which they consider as portentous as that which has menaced you for several generations? Will you turn a deaf ear to them when they ask that, while this Government is taking steps to secure the exclusion of this yellow race which they deem absolutely necessary to their own existence, you shall strengthen the hands of the Commander in Chief by the forces which he declares absolutely essential to the proper defense of our interests, our peace, and our security? [Applause.] That is the only proposition before this House now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to say anything upon this subject, but simply to vote against the proposition for four battle ships; but as it has become necessary for me to leave before the vote will be taken by roll call, and as I can not be placed upon record in any other way except by expressing myself, I shall consume the one minute which I have asked for in placing myself on record as opposed to four battle ships, which are now being discussed. As a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs I wish to say that there is only one member of that committee who signed the minority report. The members of that committee, after having carefully investigated the question, have reported in favor of two battle ships, which is tantamount to reporting against four, for the reason that the question was thoroughly discussed before this committee. It is true that many of the laboring people of this country are in favor of the battle ships, and I do not blame them, because it would give them extra work to do. Many of the politicians are in favor of the proposition, because it would give them votes which they seek. The trusts are in favor of them, because it will allow them to perpetuate the power which they now have through the instrumentality of the high protective tariff. This proposition of four battle ships could not be entertained for a moment if it was not for the enormous surplus which is in the Treasury and which has been accumulated there through the medium of the high protective tariff. It is said that the "tariff is the mother of trusts," and the Republican party is the father. These trusts have been traveling at a fast gait. They are now traveling in the air, and on the ides of next November that balloon which has been inflated so long will be punctured by the great Democratic party in this nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to talk about the action of the committee. It is true that the minority report was only signed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

I voted for four battle ships, and the committee understood generally that I was for four battle ships from that time until now. I did not sign the minority report. The gentleman from Louisiana became a member of the committee since the proposition for the increase of the Navy was acted on by the committee. His predecessor [General Meyer] from Louisiana, either by telegram or by letter, voted for the naval programme. He voted for the four battle ships and for the submarines.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. How does it occur that the proceedings in the committee are a subject of discussion before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman is sustained if the gentleman is discussing what took place in the committee.

Mr. TALBOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, whilst I did not sign the minority, I am now and have always been in favor of an American Navy commensurate with our wealth and our importance. I insist that there is but one way for the American people

to preserve their commerce, protect their Government, protect themselves, and command the seas, and that way is that we shall have what we are entitled to have, what the people are perfectly willing to vote and pay for, the greatest navy that any nation on the earth possesses. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as the Monroe doctrine is concerned and as discussed, the best evidence in the world that the other nations believe that the American nation will enforce it, and the best evidence in the world that they will violate it if they can, is proved by what happened during the civil war. During our civil war, while we were shooting each other down, the French nation took possession of Mexico, planted their army, put a king in power, and kept him there until our war was ended.

What happened then? Simply because we emerged from that war with the best navy in the world then, a modern navy with ironclads and gunboats, as soon as that war was ended and the American nation made the demand, the French troops left and a republican form of government was established. Now, Mr. Chairman, I insist that it is the duty of this Congress to do what the President asks us to do. I am not doing it because the President asks it, but because I believe it is right; but the President of the United States, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, has the absolute right, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to say to us what he thinks is proper. He may have some information that we do not possess; the Secretary of State may have some information that we do not possess, but it is good policy for this Congress to keep in touch with the increased navies of the other nations and, if possible, to excel them in tonnage and armament.

I do not want all of my time, I am not able to talk, but I hope, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOBSON. Yield it to me.

Mr. TALBOTT. If I have any time, I will yield it to the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no time to yield.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for twelve minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. HOBSON. Twelve minutes only, and in view of the long time Mr. TAWNEY had—

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the committee debate upon this paragraph will cease in fifteen minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. I must ask my twelve minutes. I have not had a fair showing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to occupy twelve minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to object to the request of the gentleman—

Mr. HOBSON. Then let me have ten minutes.

Mr. FOSS (continuing). But I desire myself to say something upon this amendment before the close of the debate, and ask recognition at the close of five minutes, inasmuch as that will leave only ten minutes for debate.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, when we sift this whole question of all these accessories and come down to the vitals there is no dissent in this Congress that the United States' vital interests are not adequately taken care of by arbitration or any other means, but must depend upon the nation's power itself without placing a vain hope upon benevolence in others. It must be power, and the gentleman from Ohio has recognized it, the gentleman from Missouri, and the gentleman from Mississippi—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I must decline, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, between the two forms of power, military power makes a people military, naval power leaves them free. If it is possible we ought to secure our vital interests by naval power.

Then, what should be the amount of that power? It should be adequate. It should be such that an enemy approaching from any direction could be contested for the supremacy of the sea. Upon investigation we find that in the Atlantic Ocean today we are not capable of contesting the supremacy of the sea; upon the Pacific Ocean we are not capable of contesting the supremacy of the sea. All our vital interests exposed on both oceans are looking to Congress to provide for their security. When the Union was formed the National Government took upon itself to protect from the outside world the individual States in the exercise of their rights. To-day the United States Government can not protect the States along our coast lines. Last year it could not protect California in its rights; to-day it can not protect any State on the Atlantic seaboard. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] has referred to the fact that the fleet is coming back. Yes; the fleet is coming back

from the Pacific Ocean because we need it in the Atlantic as well as in the Pacific. [Applause.] With only one fleet for two oceans, the world will know our fleet as the "wandering fleet," as it goes back and forth forever from one ocean to the other. This two-ocean need demands a large increase in size, and the recent revolution in naval architecture demands building the Navy over anew.

Mr. Chairman, the Naval Committee's conviction is for four battle ships, the President is for four battle ships, the Secretary of the Navy is for four battle ships, the General Board is for four, and more than that, Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States want four battle ships. You may not recognize this fact, but the war between Russia and Japan has brought home to our people that we require a defense in two oceans and have not provided it. They are realizing that the oceans are bridged and the armies of the world are in striking distance. You may ignore the fact or not, but the eyes of our people have followed the fleet around these oceans, and they know in connection with the changes in the Pacific what it all means. The great substrata instinct of self-preservation that has run through the human race for a thousand years is running high, running strong, running deep in the American people. Yes; and more. I believe there is a Providence whose guiding hand runs down the ages. I believe with the annihilation of space by the great modern forces of nature that men of the world, nations of the world, races of the world, are thrown together. I believe America has come upon the stage at the critical time when her influence should expand for the good of mankind. We have been a youth, but now we are a man. Some might wish us to remain a youth, with only a youth's responsibilities, but we can not do so as a nation any more than you can remain a boy after you are grown.

America is full grown. She has graduated. I believe that under Providence she has a great work to do in the world, and the chief work is that of peace. Not that she should go beyond her legitimate sphere to impose peace upon others, but she should use the power that gives her self-defense to stand for just policies where all nations gather and where her interests are involved, particularly in standing against the dismemberment of China.

Now, Mr. Chairman, four battle ships are not adequate for this. Four battle ships is not the full policy I am advocating. Four battle ships will not keep our Navy to-day as to relative standing where it was in the Atlantic heretofore, leaving out the Pacific altogether. Even those who believe in a two-battle-ship programme should remember that year before last we authorized none, and four would fill the gap. Even the gentleman from Ohio knows that while you are on the frontier you can not go unarmed among the natives. We are living on the frontier of the world, where there are no courts as yet—no sheriff, no constable. And since we have to go armed, we should be properly armed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] is recognized.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, under the Constitution of the United States it is the duty of the President from time to time to give to Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. No one doubts but that the President of the United States has performed his duty, but in the Constitution of the United States I read another clause, and that is, "That Congress shall have power to provide and maintain a navy." [Applause.] Now, it is for us, Members of the House of Representatives, upon our own individual responsibility as Members of this House, to pass upon the questions before it. We are responsible alone for our actions. The message of the President of the United States was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs at the beginning of Congress, and the committee in the exercise of its duties gave consideration to the recommendations of the Executive, and they have brought in here a naval programme of two battle ships, believing that it would meet with the fair sense and judgment of the membership of this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Navy consisted simply of battle ships, and it was not necessary to officer or to man them, or to provide for shore stations or colliers or dry docks or anything else, this might be a small proposition. But in a few moments this House will have an opportunity, after we have passed the paragraph in this bill, to decide whether we shall authorize two fleet colliers, costing \$1,800,000 apiece, or \$3,600,000 in all.

When the Naval Committee reports upon the needs of a navy and as to the naval programme, it must take into consideration all these other questions—the maintenance of shore stations, the authorization of colliers and dry docks, and other things which go to make up a strong and efficient navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I might speak about the naval programmes of foreign nations. This year England's naval programme, as I stated in my remarks, amounts to one battle ship and one armored cruiser and eight fast cruisers. France recommends, or proposes to build, six battle ships, but she has a continuous naval programme. Germany has a continuous naval programme. Japan's programme for 1908 has not been officially announced. But two battle ships of over 19,000 tons displacement are to be laid down in the near future, and the proposition to build two large cruisers of more than 18,000 tons, together with other fast cruisers, has been reported, but not yet substantiated. It is also reported that other battle ships and armored cruisers in addition to those mentioned above are proposed for construction in 1908.

It seemed to the committee, compared with the naval programmes of other countries during the present year, that this was a fair and reasonable authorization on the part of Congress.

Now, gentlemen, I want to say to you I do not believe in the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] or that of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I do not believe in one battle ship, and I do not believe in no battle ship at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that he may have the remainder of the time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we have reached that stage of civilization where we can do without a navy. I do not believe we have reached that stage of human perfection where it is not necessary to have a national defense of some kind. I do not believe with the gentleman from Ohio that we can depend for national defense purely upon the enforcement of the Golden Rule or the Ten Commandments. Human nature is as it is, and we must meet it as it is, and we must authorize the establishment of a national defense as we find human nature to exist to-day, and not as it ought to be.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has brought in here a proposition for two battle ships. We believe in an orderly development and construction of the new Navy. Last year the President of the United States said that we needed one battle ship, and this year he asks for four battle ships. I do not believe in a spasmodic development of the American Navy; but I believe in a moderate, systematic development of so many ships a year. I would say two ships a year. When I first came to the chairmanship of this Committee on Naval Affairs I wrote in my report these words, which I would reiterate, as to what shall be the future naval policy:

Let us build as we have been building—gradually, on broad lines and upon the most advanced ideas of naval construction; not so fast that we will be ahead of the advance of naval progress, but slow enough to secure all the benefits of new improvements and new inventions; or, better still, to do as the American Navy has always done when given an opportunity, to lead the march of the best naval construction, which it demonstrated its ability to do on at least one memorable occasion in American history—when the little "cheese box of Ericsson" in that great contest with the *Merrimac* blazed the pathway for the mighty battle ships of to-day.

In my judgment it is upon that line we should build up the American Navy, not one ship in one year, four ships the next year, and go back to one the year after that. I would build it upon the broad, conservative, statesmanship line. We need a navy, an efficient, strong navy for the maintenance of our interests on this hemisphere and on the other.

I may say to you, gentlemen, that it has been the policy of the committee of which I have been chairman to present a moderate programme that would meet with the fair sense and judgment of the American people, and at the same time a programme which not only keeps up the efficiency, but continues the building up of the Navy. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All debate upon this paragraph is exhausted. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Division!

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 79, noes 190.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided, and tellers reported—ayes 83, noes 190.

So the amendment was rejected. [Loud applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I now offer an amendment to strike out "two" and insert "one."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 2, strike out "two" and insert "one," so as to read "one first-class battle ship."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. TAWNEY) there were—ayes 65, noes 205.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBSON. I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 76, line 2, strike out "two" and insert "three," so that it will read "three first-class battle ships."

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOBSON) there were—ayes 64, noes 208.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "by contract or in navy-yards, as hereinafter provided," on lines 1 and 2 of page 76, and add, after the word "eight," on line 7, on page 76, the following provision: "At least one of such battle ships shall be built and constructed, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, at one of the navy-yards; the other of said battle ships may also be constructed at one of the navy-yards, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, or by contract, as hereinafter provided."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask the gentleman to reserve the point.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not make any difference. The gentleman could not speak to the amendment.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I should like to discuss it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right, I will wait until the gentleman from New York concludes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress a provision of this kind was held to be in order. The bill provides for the building of two battle ships. It provides further that construction may be had either in a navy-yard or by contract, in the discretion of the Secretary. One of the battle ships built under the act of June, 1902, was built at one of the navy-yards, while the other battle ship authorized by that act was built under contract. The present bill provides for discretionary power in the Secretary, so that the amendment now offered presents a mere question as to whether the Secretary shall build at least one of the ships at the navy-yard, or may build under contract, or shall build one of the ships in a navy-yard and one under contract. In directing the manner in which the expenditure may be made the House may direct also how and in what manner the expenditure may be incurred. The point of order was made in the last Congress on a matter substantially similar, and the Chairman ruled the provision to be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair now recollects, the amendment offered in the last Congress was to a succeeding section of the bill, was it not, and not to this paragraph?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That I do not distinctly recall.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought perhaps the gentleman had the RECORD before him.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not recall that, but do recall that it was ruled to be in order, and the point of order then raised against it was not sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule; the Chair does not care to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that in the Fifty-sixth Congress—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has not before him the ruling made at the last Congress, although the impression and recollection of the Chair is that the amendment was then offered to a succeeding paragraph in the bill. But the paragraph now before the committee contains the provision that the Secretary of the Navy may build the vessels herein authorized by contract or in such navy-yards as he may designate. That provision of itself might be considered legislation, but, if so, any amendment germane to it would be in order. The Chair thinks the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is germane, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order. [Applause.]

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Foss) there were—198 ayes and 36 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which will save twelve months in building a ship.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, on page 76, after line 7, the following: "And toward the construction of each vessel thus authorized the sum of \$2,500,000 is hereby appropriated, \$1,500,000 toward construction and machinery and \$1,000,000 toward armor and armament; in all \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That each vessel shall be completed within twenty-four months of the date of signing of the contract for its construction."

Mr. FOSS. I make a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSS. That it is not germane to this section of the bill.

Mr. HOBSON. If anything is germane to anything authorized, it is the money with which to secure—

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman wait a moment? I have not finished. It is not germane to this section of the bill. If it is germane at all, or if it is in order at all, it would be germane to the section on page 79, construction and machinery, and armor and armament. I am of the opinion that this is new legislation.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, this is germane for two reasons: First, that it is the money with which the ship can be begun, and second, because the time of completing the ship is germane to the ship. It saves twelve months; and furthermore, it is no more new legislation than the paragraph is that authorizes the two battle ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered provides that such vessel shall be completed within twenty-four months from the signing of the contract for its construction, and without passing on the other point of order it is clearly a matter of legislation, and hence is obnoxious to the rule, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the committee?

The question was taken, and it was decided that the opinion of the Chair should stand as the opinion of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, after the word "eight," add the following: "*Provided*, That the construction of these ships is begun and continued on approved plans which shall be altered, if expedient, in accordance with the information gained from a test made under this appropriation that shall be carried out at once with outside high explosive shells carrying the heaviest charges of the most powerful explosive ever employed in such shell and fired with velocities to simulate a range of 10 miles, one against the turret and another against the belt armor of the coast-defense vessel Florida, to determine the resistances and protection necessary to safeguard against such shells, the vitals, and personnel in the new ships."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that, that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order. Does the gentleman from Vermont desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I will submit the question to the Chair without arguing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ten torpedo-boat destroyers, to have the highest practicable speed, and to cost, exclusive of armament, not to exceed \$800,000 each.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, after line 10, insert:

"Two fleet colliers, 16 knots speed.

"Not less than 12,500 capacity cargo and bunker coal. Cost not to exceed \$1,800,000 each, and toward the construction of both \$1,500,000 is hereby appropriated."

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, there is one subject in connection with the Navy that should receive the attention of every business man. I wish to call the attention of the House to the condition of the Navy as far as colliers now owned and which should be owned by the Navy are concerned. We are consuming an immense amount of coal each year in the Navy—600,000 tons.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. Is this a committee amendment?

Mr. LOUD. It is with the consent of the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. Then it is a committee amendment.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would state that this subject of colliers has been very carefully considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs. I think I may say that every member of the committee believes that we ought to have more colliers, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD], as chairman of the subcommittee having under consideration the investigation of this subject, offers this amendment for two fleet colliers with the approval, I think, of every member of the committee.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is that in addition to the colliers carried in the bill?

Mr. FOSS. There are no colliers carried in the bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understood the gentleman to say that the bill carried two fleet colliers.

Mr. FOSS. I said that there would be an opportunity to vote for them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman please state the reason why it was not incorporated in the bill, if it is an amendment having the approval of the whole committee?

Mr. FOSS. I will state to the gentleman that it had not been fully considered by the subcommittee—the subject of colliers—at the time the bill was finished and made up.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman to give the impression to the House that the subject was in no wise considered before the bill was reported to the House?

Mr. FOSS. No; it was considered, but no definite determination had been taken upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "coal" in the amendment insert:

"One of said colliers to be built in such Government yard as the Secretary of the Navy shall direct."

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon the amendment to the amendment if the gentleman is not going ahead.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words. The House a few moments ago voted to build one of the battle ships provided for in this bill in one of the Government navy-yards. Two sessions ago two battle ships were provided for, one of which was built in the navy-yard in New York and the other was built in a private shipyard. As our Navy is growing, and it looks as if we were going to provide for a larger Navy, it is necessary to have the fleet supplied with coal. It is useless to build a fleet and send it to the Pacific Ocean or anywhere else unless we can have coal go along with it. It is necessary to have colliers and to provide a fleet of colliers, and I think we should adopt the same measures of ascertaining the comparative economy of building in the Government yards and in private yards that we do with the battle ships.

We have in this country navy-yards representing hundreds of millions of dollars in investment, costing over \$16,000,000 a year in maintenance, in which yards we are practically doing no construction work. We have been threatened here with the invasion of the yellow man. From wherever the trouble may come, we have not the navy-yards in this country practically in any condition for construction work. At a time like that the navy-yards would be the necessary thing that the Government should have in a condition to be utilized at once, and it is with this in view that I have offered this amendment, so that one of these colliers can be built at a Government yard. If the other is built in a private yard, so there may be a comparative test, and in case of need we may have a force of competent men which we may use when we need them. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire the attention of the House for a moment. This is a proposition to build two fleet colliers. The committee is in favor of the amendment. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MAYNARD] has amended the motion by providing that one of those colliers shall be built in a navy-yard. I want this committee to understand that the building of this collier in a navy-yard will cost at least 10 per cent more. The constructor told me yesterday 15 per cent was a safe margin. I want this committee to understand that the building of this battle ship upon which they voted will cost several hundred thousand dollars more built in a navy-yard than if built by private contract—

Mr. TAWNEY. A million two hundred thousand dollars more.

Mr. FOSS. Standing here as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I want to say that looking after the economical construction of the American Navy I think the committee ought to know these things. I am going to ask the Clerk to read from a letter from the Secretary of the Navy showing what he says as to the comparative cost of building a battle ship in a navy-yard and building one by private contract. You will recall the fact that Congress did authorize the building of the *Connecticut* in the Government navy-yard and at the same time it authorized the building of the *Louisiana* by private contract, sister ships in every respect, and as a result of that the Government had to pay between \$350,000 and \$400,000 more in the construction of the *Connecticut* than in the construction of the *Louisiana*.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. OLCOTT. Is it not true, however, the repairs already on the *Louisiana* have greatly exceeded those on the *Connecticut*?

Mr. FOSS. That statement has been circulated and carried through the press and also sent through circulars to Members of the House that the repairs upon the *Louisiana*, the contract ship, were 25 per cent more than upon the ship built in a Government navy-yard, but it is not the fact, and I am authorized by the Chief Constructor of the Navy to say that it is not the fact. Now, I send a full statement from the Chief Constructor of the Navy, and I ask the Clerk to read it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, before that is read, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FOSS. I do.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it not a fact that the time of the building of the ship in the navy-yard was reduced by 50 per cent, compared with the time it took to build the *Louisiana*?

Mr. FOSS. No.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Well, the time was materially reduced, was it not? I may not be right about the percentage.

Mr. FOSS. They were built about the same time.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it not a fact the *Louisiana* went into the yard to be completed, while the *Connecticut* fully three months before was fully equipped and ready for sailing?

Mr. FOSS. The *Louisiana* went into the yard, but only such work was performed upon her as it was the duty of the Government to perform under the contract, and that is upon the authority of the Chief Constructor of the Navy.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Well, how is it, then, that the *Louisiana* was not equipped, was not fitted out, but a great deal of work had to be done toward completion, while the *Connecticut* was absolutely equipped and fitted and was ready to sail?

Mr. FOSS. Here is the report of the Chief Constructor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment—

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Navy may be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] asks unanimous consent that the letter he has sent to the Clerk's desk may be read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 9, 1908.

SIR: Complying with the request contained in your letter of the 30th ultimo, I beg to inclose herewith a comparative statement of the cost of building the *Connecticut* and *Louisiana*, as shown by the records of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; also separate statements showing the expenditures on these vessels for repairs and alterations up to December 31, 1907. The expenditures under repairs and alterations include about \$8,000, chargeable to the grounding of the *Connecticut*, for which there is no corresponding charge for the *Louisiana*. Aside from

some drafting work in connection with the completion of plans, there have been no expenditures on either of these vessels since December 31, 1907.

In comparing the cost of building the *Connecticut* at the Navy-Yard, New York, with the cost of building the *Louisiana* by contract, only the first summations of the comparative statement should be considered—i. e., \$4,562,093.57 for the *Connecticut*, as compared with \$4,188,468.36 for the *Louisiana*. The last two items of this statement cover the cost of armor and permanent ordnance fittings which were supplied by the Government for both ships, and the cost of which does not, therefore, affect the comparison of cost of navy-yard work with the cost of contract work.

Very respectfully,

V. H. METCALF,
Secretary.

Hon. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS, M. C.,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Cost of repairs and alterations to U. S. S. *Connecticut* to December 31, 1907.

TITLE "D."

[Charged to annual appropriations to the several bureaus.]

	Equip- ment.	Ordnance.	Construc- tion and Repair.	Steam Engineer- ing.	Total.
To July 1, 1907.....	\$14,419.82	\$1,502.44	\$34,258.94	\$3,523.24	\$53,794.44
July 1, 1907, to De- cember 31, 1907:					
Wear and main- tenance.....	23.82	310.30	12,527.13	10,158.90	23,020.15
Changes and ad- ditions.....	4,281.48	9,789.19	74,650.91	8,224.44	96,955.02
Casualties.....		296.54	4,705.76		5,002.30
Total.....	18,725.12	11,988.47	126,151.74	21,906.58	178,771.91

Cost of repairs and alterations to U. S. S. *Louisiana* to December 31, 1907.

TITLE "D."

[Charged to annual appropriations to the several bureaus.]

	Equip- ment.	Ordnance.	Construc- tion and Repair.	Steam Engineer- ing.	Total.
Prior to July 1, 1907.....	\$12,673.41	\$4,158.85	\$66,903.03	\$21,498.19	\$105,323.48
From July 1, 1907, to December 31, 1907:					
Wear and main- tenance.....	1,184.41	465.81	9,161.62	3,427.70	14,239.54
Changes and ad- ditions.....	545.03	3,245.12	36,080.58	5,030.50	44,851.23
Casualties.....		31.92	4.56		36.48
Total.....	14,402.85	7,901.70	112,189.79	29,956.39	164,450.73

Comparative statement of the cost of construction of the hull and machinery of the U. S. S. *Connecticut* and *Louisiana* to December 31, 1907.

	Connecticut.	Louisiana.
Cost of labor and material applied to construc- tion of hull and machinery:		
Under Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	\$2,994,377.49	\$8,631.68
Under Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	1,078,641.84	634.68
Under Bureau of Equipment.....	224,083.55	17,947.57
Amount paid to contractors for hull and machinery. Cost of general superintendence, office expenses, etc.:		4,073,910.22
Under Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	94,394.21	(*)
Under Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	13,490.62	(*)
Under Bureau of Equipment.....	1,323.17	(*)
Cost of drafting and clerical work:		
Under Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	108,572.48	35,195.75
Under Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	31,310.76	12,897.52
Under Bureau of Equipment.....	11,622.53	805.28
Cost of inspection at works of subcontractors for material:		
Under Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	3,082.74	3,152.47
Under Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	1,194.18	1,354.86
Amount due contractors in final settlement.....		33,938.43
Total cost of construction of hull and ma- chinery, except armor and permanent or- dnance fittings furnished by the Government.....	4,562,093.57	4,188,468.36
Cost of armor furnished by the Government.....	1,579,013.00	1,601,414.89
Cost of turret mounts and other permanent or- dnance fittings furnished by the Government and chargeable to Title A, Cost of construction.....	246,152.88	267,764.35
Total cost of completed vessel under Title A.....	6,387,260.05	6,057,647.60

*All charges of this nature for the *Louisiana* are included in "Amount paid to contractors."

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 4, 1908.

Paymaster General, U. S. N.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to advocate the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MAYNARD]. I have been told, personally, by the Secretary of the Navy that the difference in cost between the *Con-*

necticut and Louisiana was less than 5 per cent, and that in the cost of the *Connecticut* he figured salaries, and so forth, which were not figured in the cost of the *Louisiana*.

Mr. FOSS. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Certainly.

Mr. FOSS. The letter from the Secretary of the Navy which has just been read states that the *Connecticut* cost \$373,625 more.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Which is substantially 5 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Quite substantially.

Mr. FOSS. I wish to state that the contractor said in the construction of a collier—

Mr. BENNET of New York. I can not yield to the gentleman further.

Mr. FOSS. The percentage will be larger.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I have been shown in the navy-yard in Brooklyn, which is not in my district, and which as far as it exists is a detriment to me politically, a collier in course of construction which has been constructed the quickest of any collier ever built for the United States Navy. We need these fleet colliers and we need them quickly. I do not think there is any substantial difference in the cost, and whatever difference there is is made up by the more efficient ship.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that eight hours prevail in the navy-yards and nine hours in the private yards?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Eight hours in the navy-yard and more outside—I do not know how much. When Admiral Evans, with his more than forty years of experience, came to select his flagship for this magnificent Pacific fleet he took the *Connecticut* of all that there were, because he said it was the most efficient battle ship in the United States Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Just a question.

Mr. CALDER. Does the gentleman know that Admiral Evans stated that the *Connecticut* was a 25 per cent better ship than the *Louisiana*?

Mr. BENNET of New York. If my colleague assures me so, I know that it is so.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I should add to that that the Secretary of the Navy told me that Admiral Evans had said so to him.

Mr. BENNET of New York. All right. I can reiterate that it must be so.

Mr. FOSS. Does the gentleman from New York live near a navy-yard?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; there is one in my district.

Mr. FOSS. I thought so.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I decline to yield further. Further than that, when the *Connecticut* and the *Louisiana* were both authorized, the result was that the building of a ship in a United States yard brought about the quickest-built ship in the history of modern battle ship building. That is another score on the side of Government work. Another one is that we have got to have a regulator for these outside concerns, for they charge us any price they please if combined, and we have got to keep their figures down, and that is what we did with the *Louisiana*.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the contractors who build ships by contract could charge anything they pleased, did he not?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Of course they can.

Mr. MADDEN. A few minutes before that he stated that the Government-built ships cost 5 per cent more than contract-built ships.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, if a battle ship costs \$10,000,000, how much is 5 per cent of the \$10,000,000 that the Government pays more?

Mr. BENNET of New York. The gentleman can do his own figuring. But with the Government out of the race, these four or five shipbuilding concerns outside of the Government can get together and make their own figures.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him this one question?

Mr. BENNET of New York. I have only one minute, and I respectfully decline to yield. I think we can do better than that—when our plants get down to business. When they can take advantage of that, there will be few ships built in out-

side yards, and for these reasons I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia will be carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, may be true. I have not made an investigation, and I am inclined, for the sake of the argument, to accept his statement that the *Connecticut* did cost 5 per cent more. But suppose his statement is true. Suppose the *Connecticut* did cost 5 per cent more. Where did that 5 per cent more go? It went to make the *Connecticut* a better ship and in better wages to the men who work in the Government yard. I do not believe any Member of this House believes that a ship built in an outside yard is as well built as it is in the navy-yards. In the case of a ship built by a private concern the work is hurried. It is cut and pared in every particular that it can be to make a saving, because after they make the competitive bids and get the ship they then have to get a profit out of the ship and do not put any more in than the Government compels them. The saving of 5 per cent is more than taken up in the things necessary to be done after the ship is turned over and in repair.

In a Government yard the conditions are different, and it is not wonderful to me that a ship is turned out like the *Connecticut*. The way it is done speaks well for the Government yards. They built the *Connecticut*, and the *Louisiana* cost 5 per cent less, it is claimed. Where does the money go? Into a better-built ship, a much cheaper ship in the long run. The mechanics and employees at the Government yards work eight hours a day. The difference in price is the extra hour taken from labor without just compensation. Now, this House has put itself on record more than once as being in favor of an eight-hour day for the employees of the Government. [Applause.] Here is a proposition that you are going to build two colliers. We have already divided the battle ships. We want to make the test, as we are now doing in battle ships, as to which is the most profitable to the Government in the building of colliers, Government work or contract. We all recognize that a great navy must have fleet colliers to carry the coal. Therefore we must continue to increase the collier fleet.

This House having gone on record in favor of an eight-hour day for the mechanics and employees of the Government yards, is it fair or honest to refuse to give them employment because a private yard saves 5 per cent by working nine hours? This is a proposition to build one of these ships in a Government yard, with an eight-hour day and only 5 per cent increase in cost, and a better ship as against the nine-hour day's work in the private yard. I do not believe that this House, after its previous record on the eight-hour bill, is now going to turn around and stultify itself by refusing to adopt this amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Loun] of Government yards and the eight-hour day. [Loud applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am about to move to close debate upon the paragraph and all amendments to it; but before doing so I desire to state here I have no interest so far as I am concerned personally in connection with the building of these ships. I do not represent a Government navy-yard or live in the vicinity of a Government navy-yard. I want this committee to understand that it means several hundred thousand dollars more to build a battle ship in a Government navy-yard than it will by private contract; and now I bow to the will of the committee, whichever way it may vote on this proposition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph and the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to close debate on the paragraph and the amendments thereto.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Division!

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 156, noes 27.

So the motion to close debate was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment and the amendment to the amendment were read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Division!

The CHAIRMAN. Is a division called for?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I withdraw the demand for division.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for a division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 156, noes 43.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

[Applause.]

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LOUD. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask the same privilege.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the request been put by the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be forced to object to that.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20471, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill indicated.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, pending that I move that the House do now take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11.30 o'clock.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. PAYNE the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division!

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 150, noes 75.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Without any desire to dispute the count, I ask for tellers.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order that the demand for tellers is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I now ask for the yeas and nays, and thank God in the same breath that the Chair can not rule that out of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. It is difficult to see, under the circumstances, why the gentleman should thank God for that.

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman plants himself on the Constitution, his rights are always respected. [Laughter.]

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 153, nays 105, answered "present" 9, not voting 120, as follows:

YEAS—153.

Alexander, N. Y.	Cook, Pa.	Foster, Ind.	Howland
Allen	Cooper, Pa.	Foulkrod	Hubbard, Iowa
Ames	Cooper, Wis.	French	Hubbard, W. Va.
Andrus	Cox, Ind.	Fuller	Huff
Bartholdt	Crumacker	Gaines, W. Va.	Humphrey, Wash.
Bates	Currier	Gardner, Mass.	Jenkins
Birdsall	Cushman	Gardner, Mich.	Jones, Wash.
Bonyne	Dalzell	Gardner, N. J.	Keifer
Boyd	Darragh	Gilham	Kennedy, Iowa
Brownlow	Davidson	Gillett	Kennedy, Ohio
Burke	Davis, Minn.	Goebel	Kinkaid
Burleigh	Dawson	Graff	Knapp
Burton, Del.	Denby	Greene	Knowland
Burton, Ohio	Diekema	Hale	Küstermann
Butler	Douglas	Hamilton, Mich.	Landis
Calder	Draper	Hardwick	Langley
Calderhead	Driscoll	Haskins	Laning
Campbell	Durey	Haugen	Law
Capron	Dwight	Hawley	Lawrence
Cary	Ellis, Oreg.	Hayes	Lindbergh
Caulfield	Englebright	Henry, Conn.	Littlefield
Chaney	Esch	Higgins	Longworth
Chapman	Fairechild	Hill, Conn.	Loud
Cocks, N. Y.	Focht	Hinshaw	Loudenslager
Cole	Fordney	Holliday	Lovering
Conner	Foss	Howell, N. J.	Lowden

McCall
McKinlay, Cal.
McKinley, Ill.
McLachlan, Cal.
McLaughlin, Mich.
McMillan
Madden
Madison
Mann
Miller
Moore, Pa.
Morse
Mouser

Mudd
Murdock
Needham
Nelson
Nye
Olcott
Parker, N. J.
Parsons
Payne
Perkins
Porter
Pray
Reeder

Reynolds
Scott
Slomp
Smith, Cal.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Mich.
Snapp
Stafford
Steenerson
Sterling
Sturgiss
Sulloway
Tawney

Thomas, Ohio
Tirrell
Volstead
Waldo
Wanger
Watson
Wilson, Ill.
Wood
Woodyard
Young

NAYS—105.

Adair
Adamson
Alken
Alexander, Mo.
Ansberry
Ashbrook
Bartlett, Ga.
Beall, Tex.
Bell, Ga.
Booher
Bowers
Brantley
Brodhead
Brundidge
Burgess
Burleson
Burnett
Candler
Carlin
Carter
Clark, Mo.
Clayton
Cooper, Tex.
Craig
Cravens
Crawford
De Armond

Denver
Dixon
Ellerbe
Ferris
Finley
Flood
Floyd
Foster, Ill.
Fulton
Gaines, Tenn.
Garner
Garrett
Gill
Godwin
Gordon
Granger
Gregg
Hackett
Hackney
Hamill
Hamilton, Iowa
Hammond
Hardy
Harrison
Hay
Heflin
Helm

Henry, Tex.
Hitchcock
Hobson
Houston
Hughes, N. J.
Hull, Tenn.
Humphreys, Miss.
Johnson, Ky.
Johnson, S. C.
Jones, Va.
Kellher
Kitchin, Claude
Lamar, Mo.
Leake
Legare
Lloyd
McLain
Macon
Maynard
Moore, Tex.
Murphy
Nicholls
O'Connell
Padgett
Page
Peters
Raney

Randell, Tex.
Reid
Richardson
Robinson
Rothermel
Rucker
Russell, Mo.
Russell, Tex.
Sabath
Saunders
Sheppard
Sherley
Sherwood
Sims
Smith, Mo.
Smith, Tex.
Spight
Stephens, Tex.
Talbot
Tou Velle
Watkins
Willert
Williams
Wilson, Pa.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Bennet, N. Y.
Cousins
Fassett

Foster, Vt.
Goulden

Lee
Moon, Tenn.

Roberts
Slayden

NOT VOTING—120.

Acheson
Anthony
Bannon
Barchfeld
Barclay
Bartlett, Nev.
Beale, Pa.
Bede
Bennett, Ky.
Bingham
Boutell
Bradley
Broussard
Brumm
Byrd
Caldwell
Clark, Fla.
Cockran
Cook, Colo.
Coudrey
Davenport
Davey, La.
Dawes
Dunwell
Edwards, Ga.
Edwards, Ky.
Ellis, Mo.
Favrot
Fitzgerald
Fornes

Fowler
Gillespie
Glass
Goldfogle
Graham
Griggs
Gronna
Haggott
Hall
Hamlin
Harding
Hepburn
Hill, Miss.
Howard
Howell, Utah
Hughes, W. Va.
Hull, Iowa
Jackson
James, Addison D.
James, Ollie M.
Kahn
Kimball
Kipp
Kitchin, Wm. W.
Knopf
Lafean
Lamar, Fla.
Lamb
Lassiter
Lenahan

Lever
Lewis
Lilley
Lindsay
Livingston
Lorimer
McCreary
McDermott
McGavin
McGuire
McHenry
McKinney
McMorran
Malby
Marshall
Mondell
Moon, Pa.
Norris
Olmsted
Overstreet
Parker, S. Dak.
Patterson
Pearre
Pollard
Pou
Powers
Pratt
Prince
Pujo
Ransdell, La.

Rauch
Rhinoek
Riordan
Rodenberg
Ryan
Shackelford
Sherman
Small
Southwick
Sparkman
Sperry
Stanley
Stevens, Minn.
Sulzer
Taylor, Ala.
Taylor, Ohio
Thistlewood
Thomas, N. C.
Townsend
Underwood
Vreeland
Wallace
Washburn
Webb
Weeks
Weems
Weisse
Wheeler
Wiley
Wolf

So the motion was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. PARKER of South Dakota with Mr. RYAN.

Mr. NORRIS with Mr. RAUCH.

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. MARSHALL with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. MALBY with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. McGAVIN with Mr. HAMLIN.

Mr. LILEY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah with Mr. COCKRAN.

Mr. ELLIS of Missouri with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. DAWES with Mr. BYRD.

Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. SLAYDEN.

For the balance of the week:

Mr. DOUGLAS with Mr. ANSEBERRY.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until to-morrow at 11.30 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20824) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1446), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BARCLAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20836) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the civil war, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1447), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles, which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 869) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Kennedy—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1619) for the relief of the personal representative of the estate of Alexander Myers, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2883) for the relief of the heirs of Asa O. Gallup—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3384) for the relief of the executor or administrator of the estate of C. C. Spiller, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3764) to correct the military record of Robert Mauser—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4411) for the relief of the estate of Mary N. Cox, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5924) granting relief to certain members of the Seventh Michigan Cavalry, war of the rebellion—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 19867) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Austin—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2790) granting a pension to George H. Lozon—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: A bill (H. R. 20824) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 20825) authorizing the issue of equipment of arms, ammunition, and such accouterment as accompany the same for target practice to the Alabama Boys' Industrial School, Birmingham, Ala.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 20826) to legalize a bridge across the Mississippi River between the townships of Clough, in Morrison County, and Fort Ripley, in Crow Wing County, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 20827) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell not to exceed 640 acres of land included within the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation to the University of Idaho—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20828) authorizing the appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of surveying public lands within the State of Idaho—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 20829) to increase the

amount fixed as the limit of cost of site and building at Platteville, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 20830) to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Goldsboro, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20831) to amend an act entitled "An act in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents,'" approved May 9, 1900—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 20832) creating the Hudson River National Park Commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20833) to regulate the interstate-commerce shipments of intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 20834) to appropriate money to eradicate hog cholera—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 20835) to amend the national banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARCLAY, from the Committee on Pensions: A bill (H. R. 20836) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the civil war and to widows of such dependent soldiers and sailors—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 20837) to authorize certain extensions of the City and Suburban Railway of Washington, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20876) to provide for the erection of a public building at Princeton, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 20877) providing for appropriation for survey of public lands in Montana—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 337) directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relative to the rights of persons of Choctaw or Chickasaw Indian blood to enrollment as members of the Choctaw or Chickasaw tribes of Indians and to receive distributive shares of the tribal property as such—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 20838) granting an increase of pension to John A. Thomas—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20839) granting an increase of pension to Mary Quillen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 20840) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20841) for the relief of Robert M. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 20842) for the relief of Andrew B. Baird and James S. Baird and to confirm all sales and dispositions heretofore made by the United States out of the confiscated land of the late Spruce M. Baird, their father, known as "Baird's Ranch," in the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 20843) granting an honorable discharge to Phillip Franklin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 20844) granting an increase of pension to Susan Holley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 20845) granting a pension to Frederick H. Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 20846) granting an increase of pension to Lewis N. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20847) granting an increase of pension to John Nuckles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20848) granting relief to Edward Smith on erroneous muster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 20849) granting an increase of pension to William McMannis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20850) granting an increase of pension to Martin Hope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 20851) granting a pension to John T. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 20852) granting a pension to George Hutton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 20853) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20854) granting an increase of pension to David Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 20855) granting a pension to Harvey Sennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20856) granting a pension to Christopher Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 20857) granting an increase of pension to Edwin L. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 20858) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Dixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20859) granting an increase of pension to John J. Chance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20860) granting a pension to Miller C. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 20861) for the relief of F. S. McRady—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 20862) for the relief of J. N. Whittaker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20863) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20864) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 20865) granting an increase of pension to Adolphe R. Candy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20866) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADISON: A bill (H. R. 20867) granting a pension to Charles M. Chamblin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 20868) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 20869) granting a pension to Amelia S. Stites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 20870) granting an increase of pension to Marion Vandiver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20871) granting a pension to Charlotte D. Ohm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 20872) granting a pension to Frances M. Roach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 20873) for the relief of W. W. Walters—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 20874) granting an increase of pension to George V. H. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 20875) granting an increase of pension to John F. Simonds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of Local Union No. 71, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers, of Buffalo, N. Y., against prohibition in District of Columbia and passage of any prohibition measure—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: Petition of Central Federated Union of New York, favoring battle-ship construction in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of F. J. Hasty and 120 other citizens of King City, Mo., favoring the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephen Corwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Kansas City Clearing House Association, national banks of St. Louis, Business Men's League of St. Louis, the Tootle-Lemon National Bank, of St. Joseph, and letter of C. E. Jones, cashier of National Bank of Plattsburg, Mo., against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AMES: Petition of citizens of the United States, against atrocities practiced by the Russian Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of J. Frank Shanul and others, in favor of H. R. 15837, for a national highways commission and appropriation giving Federal aid to construction and maintenance of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph W. Le-fever—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Erie Foundry Company, of Erie, against Hepburn amendment to antitrust law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of committee of International Tuberculosis Congress, for use of the House Office Building for meeting of the association in September, 1908—to the Committee on House Office Building.

Also, petition of National Guard Association of Pennsylvania, for the Foss bill, prohibiting anyone not entitled to do so from wearing the National Guard uniform—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petitions of Griswold Manufacturing Company, Burg Compressor Company, and American Stoker Company, all of Erie, Pa., opposing the Hepburn amendment to the Sherman antitrust law (H. R. 19745)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Sharpshooters' Association of Erie, Pa., against further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Hamptonburg Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, for a highways commission and Federal aid in building roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE: Petitions of W. H. Griffin and Thomas J. Gughton, of Pittsburg, for making October 12 a holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bloomfield Board of Trade, for legislation to insure proper settlement of accounts of defunct banks and other banking institutions—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, favoring a national highways commission (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of Local Union No. 24, Photo engravers, of Cleveland, Ohio, for removal of duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of F. J. Halloway, for amendment to the Sherman antitrust law and in favor of the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and national eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles W. Price and James A. Sperry, for the Stevens bill, for removal of duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Phenix Insurance Company, favoring the Crumpacker fund order bill and the postal bank bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Edward Smith & Co., against legislation relative to interstate business affecting the sale of paints—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Fort Wayne Clearing House, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Joint City Board of Army and Navy Gar-risons, favoring S. 4642 and H. R. 15463, providing for changing of title of warrant machinists, United States Navy, to machinists, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of John J. Campbell and James Fawcett, for remedial legislation excluding labor from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petitions of Stanton (Ill.) Trade Council, for exclusion laws to prevent immigration to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of sundry churches and branches of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHANEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Nuckles—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, favoring H. R. 16096, providing for census of standing timber in United States—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, favoring battle-ship building in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles Binder and others, favoring exclusion of labor from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of citizens of the United States, against atrocities practiced by the Russian Government and favoring the Bennet resolution—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of Downtown Taxpayers' Association, favoring battle-ship construction in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Clearing House Association of Banks of Philadelphia, favoring reference of the currency question to a commission—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, against the Crumpacker census bill (H. R. 16954)—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Francis Brasel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Latah County, against H. R. 4897, providing for religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edwin L. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of National Sewing Machine Company, of Belvidere, Ill., B. Eldridge, president, for the Aldrich bill, with certain amendments—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARNER: paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Judge L. Dixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILHAMS: Petitions of John W. Earle and 108 other citizens of Albion; Ed. White and 16 other citizens of St. Joe, F. B. Moe and 19 other citizens of Fort Wayne, W. S. Smith and 18 other citizens of Larwell, and W. C. Etzold and 189 other citizens of Fort Wayne, all in the State of Indiana, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of W. H. Griffin, of Pittsburg, for making October 12 a national holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE: Petition of Board of Trade of Knoxville, Tenn., for appropriation to improve the Tennessee River above Knoxville—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Chelsea (Vt.) Grange, No. 362, of Chelsea, Vt., for a national highways commission and appropriation for Federal aid in building highways (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of T. E. Mitchell and others, for a national highways commission and Federal aid in construction of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of board of directors of San Jose Chamber of Commerce, against the Aldrich bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Federated Trades Council, favoring H. R. 10556, for alleviating sufferings incident to accidents in coal mines (McHenry bill)—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petitions of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, and citizens of Stonington, Conn., protesting against a ratification of a treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Shrewsbury Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Red Bank, favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LASSITER: Petition of merchants of Chase City and Nottaway, Va., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of merchants of Amelia, Va., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Peter Sullivan, urging support of labor's recent memorial to Congress and, most particularly,

remedial legislation excluding labor unions from provisions of the Sherman antitrust act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Thaddeus Fagan, for amendment to the Sherman antitrust law and in favor of the Pearre bill, employers' liability bill, and national eight-hour law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Fort Wayne Clearing House, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of civil-war veterans of Bertha, Minn., favoring a general pension bill of \$30 per month for all honorably discharged veterans of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of business men of St. Paul, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of C. G. Wheaton and others, for a national highways commission and making appropriation for construction and improvement of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRATT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Amelia F. Stites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of jewelers of Utica and New York City, favoring enactment of H. R. 18446, to regulate marking of gold-filled and gold-plated watch cases—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Business Men's Association of Ansonia, Derby, Shelton, and Seymour, Conn., against the Aldrich bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, protests of citizens of New Haven, Derby, Taftville, Waterbury, Meriden, Hartford, Danielson, and Wauregan, Conn., against the Hepburn amendment to the Sherman antitrust law (H. R. 19745)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the Emmet Club, of New Haven, Conn., against the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Minneapolis and St. Paul Clearing House Association, against the Aldrich currency bill (S. 3023)—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of Polish citizens of Trenton, N. J., favoring the Bates resolution of sympathy for the Prussian Poles—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 16, 1908.

[Continuation of the legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1908.]

The recess having expired, the House, at 11.30 a. m., was called to order by the Speaker.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the pending motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—yeas 41, noes 30.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for tellers.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order that that is dilatory. The SPEAKER. And the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the gentleman from New York state what his point of order was?

The SPEAKER. That the demand is dilatory.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not hear him state it. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PAYNE. Evidently, Mr. Speaker, no quorum is present, and to facilitate matters I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that that is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. On the contrary, it is in the nature of expedition, and not dilatory. A quorum not being present, the Door-keeper will close the door, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and as many as are in favor of the motion will, as their names are called, answer "yea;" as many as are opposed will answer "nay;" those present and not voting will answer "present," and the Clerk will call the roll.